



Calhoun: The NPS Institutional Archive
DSpace Repository

Theses and Dissertations

1. Thesis and Dissertation Collection, all items

2007-06

Implementation of Abuja II accord and post-conflict security in Liberia

Ikomi, Emmanuel Oritsejolomi

Monterey, California. Naval Postgraduate School

<http://hdl.handle.net/10945/3440>

Downloaded from NPS Archive: Calhoun



Calhoun is the Naval Postgraduate School's public access digital repository for research materials and institutional publications created by the NPS community. Calhoun is named for Professor of Mathematics Guy K. Calhoun, NPS's first appointed -- and published -- scholarly author.

Dudley Knox Library / Naval Postgraduate School
411 Dyer Road / 1 University Circle
Monterey, California USA 93943

<http://www.nps.edu/library>



NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

THESIS

**IMPLEMENTATION OF ABUJA II ACCORD AND POST-
CONFLICT SECURITY IN LIBERIA**

by

Emmanuel Oritsejolomi Ikomi

June 2007

Thesis Advisor:
Second Reader:

Letitia Lawson
Karen Guttieri

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			<i>Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188</i>	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instruction, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188) Washington DC 20503.				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE June 2007	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Master's Thesis	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Implementation of Abuja II Accord and Post-Conflict Security in Liberia			5. FUNDING NUMBERS	
6. AUTHOR Emmanuel Oritsejolomi Ikomi				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING /MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) N/A			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government.				
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE A	
13. ABSTRACT (maximum 200 words) <p>In this thesis, I show that ECOWAS and the international community, in a bid to secure an end to Liberia's intractable civil war, acceded to a power sharing arrangement among the warlords. This arrangement, which granted the warlords political legitimacy and considerable influence and control over the transition process, led to the unsustainable warlord peace of 1997. The preoccupation of the warlord dominated Council, ECOWAS, and the international community with the 1997 elections as a means of resolving the conflict resulted in the failure to restructure the security forces before the inauguration of the post-election government as stipulated by the Abuja Agreement. The failure to restructure the security forces offered the post-war Taylor government the opportunity to carry out a bogus exercise inconsistent with the Abuja Agreement, which he readily seized. The exercise resulted in the selective demobilization and gradual marginalization of the Krahn ethnic group dominated Armed Forces of Liberia (AFL), and the creation of several new armed units dominated by former National Patriotic Front of Liberia (NPFL) militias. These and the ruthlessness with which they operated escalated fears of vulnerabilities of former adversaries and this contributed significantly to the resumption of war in 1999.</p>				
14. SUBJECT TERMS Restructuring of the security forces, Power sharing, Armed Forces of Liberia, Appeasement strategy, Transitional government, Interim government, Abuja Agreement, Peace enforcement, Security provision of Abuja 11.			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 95	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL	

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

**IMPLEMENTATION OF ABUJA II ACCORD AND POST-CONFLICT
SECURITY IN LIBERIA**

Emmanuel Oritsejolomi Ikomi
Major, Nigerian Army
B.A.,(Hons) University of Calabar, 1991

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

**MASTER OF ARTS IN SECURITY STUDIES
(STABILIZATION AND RECONSTRUCTION)**

from the

**NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
June 2007**

Author: Emmanuel Oritsejolomi Ikomi

Approved by: Letitia Lawson
Thesis Advisor

Karen Guttieri
Second Reader

Douglas Porch
Chairman, Department of National Security Affairs

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ABSTRACT

In this thesis, I show that ECOWAS and the international community, in a bid to secure an end to Liberia's intractable civil war, acceded to a power sharing arrangement among the warlords. This arrangement, which granted the warlords political legitimacy and considerable influence and control over the transition process, led to the unsustainable warlord peace of 1997. The preoccupation of the warlord dominated Council, ECOWAS, and the international community with the 1997 elections as a means of resolving the conflict resulted in the failure to restructure the security forces before the inauguration of the post-election government as stipulated by the Abuja Agreement. The failure to restructure the security forces offered the post-war Taylor government the opportunity to carry out a bogus exercise inconsistent with the Abuja Agreement, which he readily seized. The exercise resulted in the selective demobilization and gradual marginalization of the Krahm dominated Armed Forces of Liberia (AFL), and the creation of several new armed units dominated by former National Patriotic Front of Liberia (NPFL) militias. These and the ruthlessness with which they operated escalated fears of vulnerabilities of former adversaries and this contributed significantly to the resumption of war in 1999.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
A.	LITERATURE REVIEW	3
B.	THESIS ARGUMENT	10
II.	THE FAILURE OF PEACE ENFORCEMENT	13
A	INTRODUCTION.....	13
B	PEACE ENFORCEMENT AND POLITICAL EXCLUSION OF THE WARLORDS (1990-1993).....	13
1.	The International Community: Initial Apathy and Limited Support.....	14
2.	Regional Political Dynamics.....	19
3.	ECOMOG Intervention and Attempt to Enforce Peace	21
a.	<i>The Intervention.....</i>	<i>21</i>
b.	<i>Peace Enforcement</i>	<i>23</i>
4.	Transition to Appeasement	30
C.	CONCLUSION	33
III.	NEGOTIATING WARLORD PEACE	35
A.	INTRODUCTION.....	35
1.	Akosombo and the Appeasement Strategy	36
2.	Abuja I & II: Adopting the Appeasement Strategy.....	38
3.	Restructuring the Security Forces.....	41
B.	CONCLUSION	44
IV.	THE FLAWED IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SECURITY PROVISIONS OF THE ABUJA AGREEMENT AND THE RESUMPTION OF WAR IN 1999.....	47
A.	INTRODUCTION.....	47
B	TAYLOR’S ELECTORAL VICTORY, RENEGING ON ABUJA AND THE EXIT OF ECOMOG	47
1.	Taylor’s Electoral Victory.....	47
2.	Reneging on Abuja and Exit of ECOMOG	49
C.	THE FLAWED RESTRUCTURING OF THE SECURITY FORCES AND THE RESUMPTION OF WAR.....	52
D	CONCLUSION	56
V.	CONCLUSION AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS.....	59
A.	IMPLICATIONS FOR CURRENT SITUATION.....	60
APPENDIX A:	SECURITY PROVISIONS OF THE AKOSOMBO AGREEMENT SEPTEMBER 1994.....	65
APPENDIX B:	REAFFIRMATION OF THE 1995 ABUJA AGREEMENT	67
APPENDIX C:	MEASURES TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH THE ABUJA PEACE PLAN.....	69

APPENDIX D: REVISED SCHEDULE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ABUJA AGREEMENT FROM CEASE-FIRE TO ELECTION AUGUST 1996—MAY 1997	71
APPENDIX E: MAP OF LIBERIA	73
LIST OF REFERENCES.....	75
INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST	81

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to express my indebtedness and profound gratitude to Professors Letitia Lawson, Karen Guittieri and Jessica Piombo and Commander Roll for everything they represented from valuable insights, mentorship, patience and especially kind words of encouragement that made this thesis realizable.

To Col Roser, Cindy Graham, Barbara Young, Derby Graham, Kim Anderson, Cheryl, Donna Carpenter and Jamien Galindo, I appreciate you sincerely.

For Dudley Knox Library and its ever cheerful bunch of good people, I appreciate you. At the risk of inadvertent omission, I particularly appreciate the tireless effort and assistance of Greta Marlatt, Irma Fink, Zooey Lober, Jennifer West, and Michele Lee Huygen.

Joey of ITAC, I appreciate you.

Pam Silva, Kate Synder and Janis Higgenbotham a big thank you.

I appreciate Major Joseph Hayden, U.S. Army, Special Forces - former Chief of Defense Cooperation, United States Embassy, Abuja, Nigeria, who facilitated this unique opportunity for graduate education at the NPS.

My dear wife and lovely wife of inestimable value, Esther, for being there and particularly for every stress and pressure I made you pass through in the course of getting this thesis out. I acknowledge your invaluable support. Finally this thesis is dedicated to our faith child Alicia Esther Ayoenewaren Ikomi.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Motivated by the general question of what determines the sustainability of post-war peace or what influences the return to war against the background of the phenomenal rise in the instability of negotiated settlement experienced in the nineties (Liberia inclusive), this thesis identifies effective implementation of a peace agreement in general, and the elements that addresses the security concerns of parties to a conflict in particular, as critical to the sustainability of post-war peace. It argues that a causal relationship exists between the flawed implementation of the Abuja II Accord of August 1996 and Liberia's return to war in 1999.

Chapter I, "Introduction," covers the purpose, importance, literature review and the argument of this thesis. It commences with an analytical review of the theoretical literature on the implementation of peace agreements, identifying factors that influence the implementation of agreements and highlighting the crucial role of agreement implementation in sustaining negotiated settlements.

Chapter II, "The Failure of Peace Enforcement," sets the stage for the argument of this thesis, which is that ECOWAS' shift from a strategy of military peace enforcement to one of appeasement resulted in warlord peace, which was the primary cause of Liberia's return to war in 1999. It examines ECOWAS's peace enforcement strategy from 1990-1993, and the factors that contributed to its abandonment in favor of appeasement. It discusses the international and regional diplomatic and political contexts of the intervention and then argues that ECOMOG's peace enforcement effort was undermined and eventually failed primarily because of the lack of political and diplomatic support rather than military failures on the ground.

Chapter III, "Negotiating Warlord Peace," traces the process by which ECOWAS and the international community legitimated the warlords as political leaders following the failure to enforce peace. It shows that the strategy faltered because ECOWAS lost leverage over the warlords, and settled for a warlord peace with the 1996 Abuja II Accord. It further argues that Abuja II might still have led to a lasting peace had it been

fully implemented. Regrettably, it was not and this set the incentive structure that led the postwar government to renege on the agreement and start down the path back to war.

Chapter IV, “The Flawed Restructuring of the Security Forces and the Resumption of War,” traces the process by which Liberian President Charles Taylor’s flawed and partisan restructuring and use of the security forces against former adversaries led to the return to war in 1999. It shows how Taylor’s rejection of his commitment to restructuring of the security forces under according to Abuja II and the forced exit of ECOMOG from Liberia exacerbated fears of vulnerability of former adversaries and political opponents, leading them to chose war over domination by Taylor.

Finally, Chapter V concludes this thesis by offering some final thoughts on the critical causal relationship between the effective implementation of a peace agreement and the sustainability of post-war peace. It crystallizes some general findings in the theoretical arguments to the end state of the Abuja II, and applies the lessons of this period to the current effort at finding sustainable stability in Liberia.

I. INTRODUCTION

What determines whether peace lasts or war resumes?¹ What element of negotiated settlement is likely to promote settlement stability or influence the return to war? The phenomenon of return to war in negotiated settlements underscores the relevance of these questions. The experience of short-lived post-conflict peace and stability was characteristic of civil wars that were hastily resolved by the international community in the mid nineties and to the present, in the rush for quick and cheap peace. Somalia, Angola (twice), Sri Lanka, Rwanda, Liberia, Sierra Leone and Côte d'Ivoire provides good examples. Evidence shows that the stability of negotiated settlements is often related to the failure to implement agreements, particularly provisions of agreements that address the security concerns of parties to conflict.² The requirement for comprehensive implementation of security provisions of a peace agreement remains crucial because the mistrust and fears of vulnerabilities that characterize negotiated settlements have the potential of undermining post-conflict stability. This is important because no meaningful or lasting post-conflict stability and reconstruction effort can take place in the absence of sustainable post-war peace and stability.

Liberia experienced the tragedy of relapsing into war two years after the end of the first civil war at the cost of not only further loss of human lives, but also the termination of the international effort at reconstruction of post-war Liberia coordinated by the UN Mission of Liberia (UNOL).³ In the words of one analyst: "The tragedy of Liberia today is the return to civil war after a devastating period of armed conflict from 1989 to 1996 that cost an estimated 200,000 lives. Since the mid-2000s, tens of thousands

¹ Virginia Page Fortna, *Peace Time: Cease-Fire Agreement and the Durability of Peace* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), 1.

² Caroline A. Hartzell, "Explaining the Stability of Negotiated Settlement to Intrastate Wars," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 43, no.1 (Feb 1999): 6.

³ "UN History in Liberia from 1989-1997 and 1997-2003." <http://www.unmil.org/content.asp?cat=history> accessed on 24 July 2005.

of additional combat-related fatalities are believed to have occurred.”⁴ Why did Liberia relapse into war? Was there a causal relationship between the resolution of the first conflict and the resumption of the second?

On December 24, 1989, the Charles Taylor led National Patriotic Front of Liberia (NPFL) invaded Liberia from neighboring Côte d’Ivoire, with the goal of removing the government of President Samuel Kanyon Doe. Following the escalation of the conflict, and in the absence of credible international response, the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) intervened with the intention of implementing a peace plan that had been crafted by the Liberian Inter Faith Mediation Committee (IFMC).⁵ ECOWAS deployed the ECOWAS Cease-fire Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) with a mandate to “keep peace, restore law and order and contain the spread of the conflict to neighboring states and to help Liberians establish an interim government until elections could be held.”⁶ ECOWAS initially pursued political option aimed at facilitating a political solution to the crisis based on the IFMC peace plan, but later adopted military option.⁷ Over time the conflict degenerated into a contest for power, territory and exploitation of lootable natural resources, which saw the emergence of new factional groups. This development further escalated the conflict and complicated its resolution. The conflict persisted and defied efforts at resolution as the warring groups broke one cease-fire agreement after another. However, after six years, ECOWAS, with support from the international community, ended the war with the Abuja II Accord of August 1996. Regrettably, this resolution was short-lived. The second Liberian civil war began in 1999.

In spite of the central role of the 1996 Abuja II Accord in the resolution of Liberia’s first civil war, no significant attention has been given to its effects on Liberia’s

⁴ Nicholas Cook, “Liberia: 1989-1997 Civil War, Post-War Developments, and U.S. Relations,” CRS Report for Congress, December 31, 2003, 1.

⁵ IFMC was a coalition of civil society organizations involved in the mediation of the Liberian conflict preceding ECOWAS intervention.

⁶ Cook, 1; Ikechi Mgbeobi, *Collective Insecurity: The Liberian Crisis, Unilateralism and Global Order* (Vancouver, UBC Press, 2003), 59.

⁷ Clement Adibe, “The Liberian Conflict and the ECOWAS-UN Partnership,” *Third World Quarterly* 18, no. 3 (1997): 471; Max Ahmadu Sesay, “Politics and Society in Post-war Liberia,” *Journal of Modern African Studies* 34, no. 3 (Sep. 1996): 396.

return to war in 1999. The literature on Liberia's first civil war dwells largely on the weaknesses of ECOMOG's military operation.⁸ While the focus on ECOMOG failures is not altogether out of place, especially for the lessons it offers military aspects of conflict resolution, the lack of attention to the diplomatic aspect of the peace process in general, and Abuja II in particular, leaves a significant gap in our understanding of the return to war in Liberia. No systematic study of a possible causal relationship between the flawed implementation of the 1996 Abuja II Accord, the security situation in post-conflict Liberia from 1997 to 1999, and the resumption of war exists. Such a study is important for the lessons it may hold for current stabilization and reconstruction efforts in Liberia as well as similar efforts to contain intractable conflicts elsewhere.

This thesis shows how the failure to implement the security provision on the restructuring of the Armed Forces of Liberia (AFL) and other security forces as contained in the Abuja II Accord of August 1996 undermined post-conflict security in Liberia between 1997 and 1999 and contributed significantly to the resumption of the civil war in 1999.

A. LITERATURE REVIEW

Until recently, the literature on ending civil wars through negotiated settlements focused largely on the signing of a peace agreement.⁹ However, the recognition of cycles of conflict – agreement - conflict has led to an increased focus on the implementation of peace agreements; that is, getting parties to a conflict to honor commitments made in the agreements. The literature on the implementation of peace agreements suggests that the sustainability of peace is affected by many factors, including fear and uncertainty after the signing of a peace agreement, the roles of third party guarantors (international, regional organizations, and other governments), the leadership of the formerly warring parties, the availability of “lootable” resources, the nature of the peace agreement and the

⁸ See for example, Hebert Howe, “Lessons of Liberia: ECOMOG and Peacekeeping,” *International Security* 21 no. 3 (1996-1997): 146.

⁹ Stephen John Stedman, “Introduction,” in *Ending Civil Wars: Implementation of Peace Agreements*, eds. Stephen John Stedman, Donald Rothchild, and Elizabeth M. Cousens, (London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2002): 1.

conflict cycle or “ripeness” of the conflict, as well the international community’s preferred option of power-sharing arrangements as a mechanism of conflict resolution in “minor” states at the end of the Cold War.¹⁰

Scholars agree that the period immediately after the signing of a peace agreement is fraught with risks, uncertainty, and vulnerability. Stedman argues that this period constitutes the greatest uncertainty in a peace process. Failure to get warring parties to live up to peace agreements has often restarted wars. He therefore stresses the need for comprehensive implementation of peace agreements in negotiated settlements.¹¹ Implementation of an agreement serves to allay fears and vulnerabilities and offers the requisite foundation on which sustainable peace and security rests. Rothschild also emphasizes the dangers of relying on the signing of peace agreements without ensuring that parties live up to their commitments. Such a gap, he argues, can create room for manipulation or reneging that can heighten fears and tensions and undermine both the peace process and post-conflict stability. “The mistrust and animosity surrounding military encounters are carried over into post-war relations. Viewing their adversaries in ‘zero-sum’ terms, leaders of various political groups are extremely uncertain about the

¹⁰ Donald Rothchild, “Settlement Terms and Post Conflict Stability,” in *Ending Civil Wars: Implementation of Peace Agreements*, eds. Stephen John Stedman, Donald Rothchild, and Elizabeth Cousens (London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2002), 117; Hartzell, 6; Mary H. Moran and M. Anne Pitcher, “The ‘basket case’ and the ‘poster child’: explaining the end of civil wars in Liberia and Mozambique,” *Third World Quarterly* 25, no. 3 (2004): 502; Paul Collier, “Economic Causes of Civil Conflict and their Implications for Policy,” in *Turbulent Peace*, eds. Chester A. Crocker, Fen Osler Hampson and Pamela Aall (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace, 2003), 144; Fen Osler Hampson, *Nurturing Peace: Why Peace Settlement Succeed or Fail* (Washington: D.C., U.S. Institute of Peace, 1996), 210; Dennis Tull and Andreas Mehler, “The Hidden Cost of Power-Sharing: Reproducing Insurgent Violence in Africa,” *African Affairs*, 104/416, (2003), 375-398; Barbara F. Walter, “The Critical Barrier to Civil war Settlement,” *International Organization* 51, no. 3 (1997): 340; Stephen Stedman and Donald Rothchild, “Peace Operations: From Short Term to Long Term Commitment,” *International Peacekeeping* 3, no. 2 (Summer): 17-35; William Zartman, *Ripe for Resolution, Conflict and Intervention in Africa* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 227; Emmanuel Kwesi Aning, “War to Peace: Dilemmas of Multilateral Intervention in Civil Wars,” *African Security Review*, 9, no 3 (2000):1-16; Matthew Hoddie and Caroline Hartzell, “Civil War Settlement and Implementation of Military Power Sharing Arrangements,” *Journal of Peace Research* 40, no. 3 (2003): 316; and Dorina A Bekoe, “Towards a Theory of Peace Agreement Implementation: The Case of Liberia,” *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 38, 2-3 (2003): 256-94.

¹¹ Stephen John Stedman, “Implementing Peace Agreements in Civil War: Lessons and Recommendations for policy Makers,” *International Peace Academy Policy Series Paper on Peace Implementation* (New York: May, 2001), 1.

transition to peace, fearing that it will result in their vulnerability and possible elimination — either as a political force or as a physical entity.”¹² Implementation of an agreement allays these fears by building confidence and signaling commitment to the agreement. Chester Crocker argues that “[p]eople assume incorrectly that after negotiated settlement things naturally wind down, without effective implementation of a peace agreement, what you get is a political ‘mess’ and untold human suffering.”¹³ Hartzell makes a similar argument, with particular reference to implementing the security provisions of an agreement. She argues that full implementation increases the incentives of parties to a conflict to stay on course with the peace process and enhances the prospect of post-conflict stability. This is likely to be so because it addresses the security concerns and fears of parties to a conflict, and provides institutional guarantees of their safety.¹⁴

Behind this consensus on the importance of complete implementation of peace agreements to lasting peace are debates about the conditions under which fears and uncertainty are most likely to be allayed and peace agreements fully implemented. The first debate revolves around whether agreements crafted and implemented by the parties themselves or by third party interveners are more likely to be fully and successfully implemented. Walter argues that “a third-party guarantor can change the level of fear and insecurity that accompanies treaty implementation and thus facilitate settlement, third parties can guarantee that groups will be protected, terms will be fulfilled and promises kept (or at least can ensure that groups can survive until new government and a new national military is formed).”¹⁵ Third-party guarantors are seen as crucial in the monitoring and implementation of sensitive provisions of an agreement such as disarming and demobilizing warring factions, and establishing national security forces.¹⁶ Stedman and Rothchild also stress the importance of third parties in a number of inter-

¹² Donald Rothchild, “Assessing Africa’s Two-Phrase Peace Implementation Process: Power Sharing and Democratization,” unpublished paper, n.d.; Rothchild, “Settlement Terms and Post -Conflict Stability,” 117.

¹³ Quoted in “Why Peace Agreement Fail or Succeed: Effective Implementation is Crucial to the Success of a Negotiated Peace Settlement Process,” *USIP Peace Watch Online*, December 1996 www.usip.org/peacewatch/1996/1296/peace.html accessed on 16 December 2005.

¹⁴ Hartzell, 6.

¹⁵ Walter, 340.

¹⁶ Ibid.

related military/security aspects of a peace agreement implementation, including overseeing the integration of a new army, allaying the fears of parties to the conflict and extracting their commitment to the agreement.¹⁷

Others, including Hoddie and Hartzell, suggest that third party guarantors may not increase the likelihood of successful implementation. They note that third-party enforcement has not consistently contributed to effective peace implementation, while agreements have often been implemented and peace endured in the absence of third-party enforcement.

[O]ur concern with this policy prescription (third party) is that it has the potential to mask the intentions behind the actions of parties to the agreement. In other words, the presence of third parties forces acting as agreement enforcers will often mean that parties to the settlement will not have the opportunity to assess whether behavior consistent with the signed agreement is based on genuine desire for peace or simply expedient behavior intended to placate the interested third parties. Because actions with the potential to serve as signals of conciliatory behavior are likely to be discounted if they are perceived as reaction to the demands of a third-party enforcer, the establishing of trust among former combatants becomes less probable and peace may prove less durable once external parties leaves the scene.¹⁸

Thus they suggest that peace is more likely to be sustainable when the leadership of warring parties reach an peace agreement and participate in its implementation without third party pressure, since “implementation serves as a concrete commitment to peace as signatories to an agreement prove willing to endure the cost associated with both compromising their original war aims and withstanding potential challenges from within their own group.”¹⁹ Warring parties’ willingness to endure these costs voluntarily is seen as providing a better guarantee of the process than third-party interventions. Bekoe adds that parties are likely to be more committed to the implementation of agreements when the level of vulnerability of the contending parties — economic, political and military — is balanced.²⁰

¹⁷ Stedman and Rothchild, 18.

¹⁸ Hoddie and Hartzell, 316.

¹⁹ Ibid., 319.

²⁰ Bekoe, 256.

Evidence shows that over time parties have a growing incentive and tendency to renege on commitments in order to maintain a stronger position in the post-war government. Post-war governments thus cannot be fully trusted to honor commitments to implement crucial provisions of agreements after the transition to post-war governance. However, third-party commitment to full implementation of peace agreements is also limited and constrained. Among the most serious of these limitations are regional and international political dynamics, including the extent of regional and international consensus and support for implementation and the activities and roles of regional and international collaborators and spoilers, and inadequate logistical, financial, and specialized peacekeeping capacities to pursue comprehensive implementation. All of these limitations are likely to be more severe when the third party is a regional organization rather than the United Nations or a major power.²¹ Closely related is Moran and Pitcher's argument that the resolution or continuation of conflict is dependent upon the calculations by the leadership of warring parties about the cost, chances, and time they require to achieve military victory.²² Similar calculations go into decisions about cooperation and compromise in the process of implementing peace agreements. To alter the calculation of warring parties' leadership and induce a compromise in a peace process, therefore, third-party interveners must have the necessary resources and capabilities — economic, military and political. Walter argues that third-party interventions are more likely to endure the political and financial cost that comprehensive implementation of peace agreement entails if they have a stake in the country of conflict - economic investments, strategic interests or colonial ties, for example. These, she argues, provide the incentive, commitment, and political will required to persevere through the challenges and costs associated with comprehensive implementation of peace agreement. Finally, a third party must have sufficient military capability to effectively deter cheating and intransigence and also be willing to use force if necessary.²³

²¹ Hampson, 210.

²² Moran and Pitcher, 502.

²³ Walter, 340.

Others point to characteristics of the conflict itself as an important determinant of the how difficult peace negotiation and implementation are likely to be. For instance, conflicts motivated by “greed,” commonly known as resource insurgencies, are largely sustained by the exploitation of “lootable” resources and are therefore believed to be less amenable to the negotiation and implementation of peace agreements. Collier argues that as long as belligerents maintain control over territories with “lootable” resources and are able to profit from the exploitation of these resources, they will have less incentive and motivation to commit to an agreement.²⁴ Similarly, Rothchild argues that such predatory behavior will continue to constitute an impediment to the implementation of a peace agreement, until it is effectively dealt with.²⁵ A peace process must therefore take into consideration the economic incentives that motivate and sustain conflict, and ensure they are addressed both in the negotiation and implementation of a peace agreement.

Zartman argues it is more difficult to negotiate and implement peace agreements when a conflict has not yet reached a mutually hurting stalemate.²⁶ When belligerents are pressured by third parties to reach a ceasefire or sign peace agreements before they have exhausted the will, resources, capability and external support to continue the conflict, their commitment to peace is likely to be thin indeed. This leaves external powers with the choice of allowing the conflict to run its course (risking massive human suffering), or promoting a negotiated settlement under less than ideal conditions. The latter option has been far more common since the end of the Cold War. Settlements signed under external pressure often involve costly concessions, may include more than can reasonably be accomplished, and may deliberately leave some difficult issues unaddressed or obscured in the interests of expediency. These unresolved issues and concessions often become problematic in the implementation process, and/or impact negatively on the end-state of the peace process, as warring parties are likely to interpret such ambiguities in ways that benefit themselves during implementation. More often than not agreements brokered

²⁴ Collier, 144.

²⁵ Donald Rothchild, “Implementation and its Effects on Building and Sustaining Peace: The Effect of Changing Structures of Incentives,” unpublished paper, University of California, Davis (2000): 2.

²⁶ Zartman, 227.

under these conditions constitute a recipe for disaster. Thus, Hampson concludes that peace agreements sometimes contain the seeds of their own destruction.²⁷

Other analysts suggest that the international community's preference for power sharing among the parties to the conflict, which has been seen as the most expedient means of resolving post-Cold War African conflicts, ultimately undermines sustainable post conflict security and stability in the long run. Tull and Mehler argue that giving "rebels" a share of state power creates incentive structures which turn the rebel path into an appealing option in the pursuit of otherwise blocked political aspirations."²⁸ The institutionalization of this practice provides political pay-offs for insurgent violence and complicates the resolution of conflict. In addition, these incentives lead to intransigence on the part of warring parties, which are likely to cooperate in a peace process and comply with an agreement only when they are sure of emerging with a significant share of power at the end of the peace processes. A power sharing strategy, Aning argues, has inherent dilemmas, contradictions and challenges that can lead either to transition from war to peace or regression back to war in the long term. All that is certain, he concludes, is the transition from overt war to a "condition of temporary non-belligerence."²⁹

Despite this extensive analysis of the crucial role of implementation of a peace agreement in the stability of negotiated settlement in the theoretical literature, studies of Liberia's first civil war are largely devoted to assessments of ECOMOG military capabilities. For instance, Howe concludes that ECOMOG failed to demonstrate that regional organizations can be viable tools in conflict resolution.³⁰ Magyar follows a similar line of reasoning, his attempt to establish the lessons of Liberia were based solely on an appraisal of ECOMOG. He assigns primary responsibility for the fragility of the post-war peace to poor planning and execution of the ECOMOG peacekeeping mission.³¹ Like Howe, he fails to explore the crucial influence of the nature and the implementation

²⁷ Hampson, 3.

²⁸ Tull and Mehler, 376.

²⁹ Aning, 1.

³⁰ Howe, 146.

³¹ Magyar , 179.

of the peace agreement that ended the war. Although Adebayo looks beyond ECOWAS' military operations and does identify weakness in the peace deal that ended the war, which he rightly terms "warlord peace," he does not explore sufficiently the critical role of the implementation of Abuja in Liberia's return to war in 1999.³² This constitutes a significant gap in the literature, which this thesis attempts to fill.

B. THESIS ARGUMENT

After six futile years of trying to end the Liberian civil war and create a lasting peace, ECOWAS and the international community legitimated the warlords as political leaders, handing the ownership of the transitional government to them through the Abuja II Accord of August 1996. The warlords were also entrusted with the responsibility to implement the peace agreement, including the provision regarding the restructuring of the AFL and other security forces. This marked a significant departure from the previous strategy, which had sought to defeat them militarily and deny them significant political influence and power in the transitional and post-war political arrangement. The agreement was generally perceived as an appeasement strategy to elicit the cooperation and compliance of the warlords in order to end the fighting. The transition process ended with the election of Charles Taylor as president, and without the restructuring of the security forces, in 1997. The failure to restructure the security forces afforded the post-war government of Charles Taylor unrestrained control and influence to block further implementation of the agreement.

Building on the scholarly consensus that comprehensive implementation of a peace agreement is crucial to sustainable post-conflict peace and stability, this thesis argues that the seriously flawed implementation of the security provisions on the restructuring of the AFL and other security forces ultimately contributed significantly to the resumption of war in 1999. This flawed implementation resulted from the power sharing arrangement, which was focused on elections as a way of peacefully resolving the conflict but resulted in the warlord peace of 1997 to 1999, which in turn facilitated the

³² Adebayo, *Building Peace in West Africa: Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Guinea-Bissau*, 58; Adekeye Adebayo, "Liberia: A War Lord's Peace," 622.

rejection of commitments in the agreement by the post-election government. Instead of establishing ethnically balanced armed forces as stipulated in Abuja II, President Taylor carried out a selective demobilization exercise, which gradually marginalized the Krahn/Mandingo dominated AFL. Other state security forces were packed with his NPFL fighters, and new armed units were created to strengthen his position vis-à-vis “former” adversaries and political opponents, most of who went into exile. These actions escalated fears of vulnerabilities and significantly undermined the fragile post-war security situation.

The flawed implementation and resumption of war in 1999 therefore affirm the need for effective third party enforcement (with regional and international support). Effective third party implementation was more likely to have constrained and reassured stronger and weaker parties respectively and forestalled the manipulations and escalation of fears of vulnerabilities in post-war Liberia that culminated in the resumption of war in 1999. The international community’s search for quick and cheap peace at the expense of the comprehensive implementation of the peace agreement was not only a recipe for disaster for Liberia; it was also not cost effective in the long run. ECOWAS and the UN would be called upon to return to Liberia in 2003, for a much more costly second effort to create a sustainable peace.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

II. THE FAILURE OF PEACE ENFORCEMENT

A. INTRODUCTION

This thesis argues that ECOWAS' shift from the largely Nigerian driven military and political strategy, which sought to defeat and deny the warlords political power, to the appeasement strategy resulted in the warlord peace, which held for only two years and was the primary cause of Liberia's return to war in 1999. This chapter sets the stage for that argument by examining the peace enforcement strategy of 1990-1993, and the factors that contributed to its abandonment in favor of appeasement. It begins by describing the international and regional diplomatic and political contexts, and then argues that ECOMOG's peace enforcement effort was undermined primarily by the lack of political and diplomatic support rather than military failures on the ground. A political solution that excluded the warlords depended upon peace enforcement in Liberia. This chapter seeks to show that such a solution could have succeeded with more regional and international support, which would have prevented the second round of the Liberian civil war and the second international peacekeeping/post-conflict security building mission.

B. PEACE ENFORCEMENT AND POLITICAL EXCLUSION OF THE WARLORDS (1990-1993)

At the extraordinary meeting of the authority of ECOWAS heads of state and government at the Bamako-Mali Summit in November 1990, the ECOWAS Peace Plan was ratified.³³ The plan proposed the establishment of a civil society led Interim Government of National Unity (IGNU) composed of the representatives of all armed groups, political parties and leaders of civil society and the holding of general elections within twelve months. It also tasked ECOMOG to provide peacekeeping support for its implementation and stipulated that the leadership of the IGNU was to be ineligible in the

³³ The plan which was drafted earlier by the ECOWAS Standing Mediation Committee (SMC) in Banjul-Gambia in August 1990 was largely an adoption of the peace plan earlier proposed by the IFMC.

general elections.³⁴ This showed a determination at the early stages of the intervention to deny the leadership of the warring parties' significant political influence in the transition process. As events unfolded the need for the application of coercive measures to compel the warlords to comply with a peace plan became clear.³⁵ Consequently ECOWAS, pushed by Nigeria, undertook two major operations to enforce peace in 1990 and 1993 respectively. The attempt to enforce peace and alienate the leadership of the warring parties, particularly Charles Taylor, did not enjoy regional or international support. This limited the effectiveness of the strategy and contributed significantly to its ultimate failure.

1. The International Community: Initial Apathy and Limited Support

There was no credible international response to the Liberian crisis prior to ECOWAS' intervention. Most observers suggest that the reluctance of the international community to get involved in the Liberian conflict was associated with Africa's reduced strategic significance following the end of the Cold War. As Tanner notes, "Liberia did not offer the same geo-strategic benefits as it did during the Cold War to justify the disbursement of material, political and moral cost of intervention and counter insurgency by the international community."³⁶

The initial Organization of African Unity (OAU, now African Union) response was limited to calls for the international community to intervene and tepid diplomatic support for ECOWAS initiatives. Given the prevailing regional and continental political dynamics and the poor finances that bedeviled the OAU, its initial limited response was

³⁴ Articles 1.2.d and 1.3 and decision A/DEC.2/8/90. Text in *Official Journal of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS's)*, November 1992; Comfort Ero, "ECOWAS and Sub Regional Peacekeeping in West Africa," *Journal of Humanitarian Assistance*, available at <http://www.jha.ac?article/a005.htm> accessed on 16 January 2006.

³⁵ Although the Peace Plan sought to accommodate all parties to the conflict, the caveat that warring parties would be ineligible in prospective elections set Charles Taylor-the chief protagonist to the conflict on collision course with ECOWAS in the implementation of the Peace plan. Taylor rejected the Peace Plan and insisted on the presidency by virtue of his control of over 90 percent of Liberia's territory. He consistently refused to recognize the interim government that was later set up and intensified military attacks on ECOMOG and Monrovia in an attempt to seize power by force. In this situation the Peace Plan only stood a chance if ECOWAS enforced compliance. Having identified Taylor as the obstacle to the peace plan, ECOWAS and Nigeria in particular attempted to defeat him.

³⁶ Victor Tanner, "Railroading Peace," *Review of African Political Economy* 25, 75 (1998):145.

not surprising. The OAU would appoint Reverend Canaan Banana, former Zimbabwean president, as its eminent person to the ongoing Liberian mediation effort in January 1993, but it was never seriously involved in the Liberia crisis.

The UN mustered the political will to respond meaningfully only three years after the outbreak of the Liberian conflict, and more than two and the half years into the ECOWAS intervention. The United Nations Security Council's (UNSC) first formal statement on the civil war was issued on 22 January 1991, more than one year after the outbreak of the conflict and five months after the deployment of ECOMOG. It commended the efforts of the ECOWAS heads of State, and called upon the parties to the conflict to respect the ceasefire agreement.³⁷ On 7 May 1992 the UNSC again commended ECOWAS and indicated that the Yamoussoukro IV Accord, which it had negotiated, offered the best possible framework for a peaceful resolution of the conflict in Liberia.³⁸

The first significant material support for ECOMOG came on 19 November 1992, when the UNSC Council responded positively to ECOWAS' request for a UN arms embargo on Liberia's warring factions. The Security Council, through resolution 788 (1992), imposed a general and complete embargo on all deliveries of weapons and military equipment to Liberia -- except for those destined for the sole use of the peacekeeping forces of ECOWAS.³⁹ The following day, in response to ECOWAS' request for the UN to play a greater role in the peace process, the UN Secretary General (UNSG) appointed Trevor Livingston Gordon-Somers as his Special Representative for Liberia.⁴⁰ Following the failure of ECOWAS' second attempt to enforce peace, the UN established the United Nations Military Observer Mission in Liberia (UNOMIL), pursuant to the Cotonou Peace Agreement of 25 July 1993.⁴¹ UNOMIL was composed of 386 observers. Its task was to support ECOMOG in implementing the Cotonou Peace

³⁷ "Liberia-UNOMIL Background," available at <http://www.un.org> accessed on 16 December 2005.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ "Liberia-UNOMIL Background."

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ UNOMIL was the first United Nations peacekeeping mission undertaken in cooperation with a peacekeeping operation already established by another organization.

Agreement, especially the compliance of all parties with the agreement. The UN involvement in the Liberian crisis signaled the beginning of the strategic shift from peace enforcement to appeasement of the warlords. The UN involvement, which promoted mediation and political accommodation and opportunity for the warlords to pursue their goals through other means, was expected to enhance the credibility of ECOMOG.⁴²

But this expectation was not fully realized as the effectiveness of the UN-ECOWAS partnership was significantly undermined by mutual mistrust and rivalry. ECOMOG saw UN involvement, and particularly its monitoring mandate, as an indication of distrust of its abilities and intentions on the one hand, and as a placation of Taylor on the other.⁴³ As result, resentment among troops and commanders hampered smooth relations. ECOMOG resentment was particularly acute in the case of Nigerian forces, who had invested substantial human and material resources in the resolution of the conflict, believed themselves better experienced than the UN to handle the conflict, and perceived the UN as incapable of dealing with the belligerents. Issues of command and control and strategy generated tension among UNOMIL and ECOMOG force commanders. For instance, UN force commander General Opande's belief that Taylor should be given the benefit of the doubt on his commitment to disarm unilaterally was dismissed as naïve by ECOMOG's force commander General John Inienger. The contentious relationship was further exacerbated by the UNOMIL's direct dealings with the NPFL without the participation of ECOMOG. Another area of friction that characterized the UNOMIL/ECOMOG partnership was the "trust the UN" public information campaign undertaken by the UN. This was interpreted by ECOMOG as implicit criticism of its credibility with the population.⁴⁴ Although ECOMOG bristled at the belated UN involvement in Liberia, its own failure to end the war after nearly three years on the ground contributed to the involvement of the UN and the recourse to political accommodation of the warlords.

⁴² Milkah, 125.

⁴³ Tuck, 9.

⁴⁴ "Liberia: Problematic Peacekeeping," *Africa Confidential* (4 March 1994): 23.

The historical relationship between the U.S. and Liberia seemed to count for little with the Cold War over. Convinced that it no longer had any important interests in Liberia, the U.S. evacuated its citizens at the onset of the war, and limited its involvement to humanitarian and diplomatic support thereafter. Lawrence Eagleburger, Deputy Secretary of State in the Bush Administration, confirmed in June 1990 that the U.S. would not be playing a lead role in the Liberian crisis, and endorsed the ECOWAS Peace Plan the following month. U.S. Ambassador to Nigeria Lannon Walker reaffirmed to General Abacha, Nigeria's Army Chief, that a solution to the crisis would have to come from the region.⁴⁵ Having encouraged ECOWAS to intervene, the U.S. did nothing to enhance ECOWAS' capacity to enforce peace. While the U.S. approved of the intervention, it apparently did not approve of the specific solution pursued by ECOWAS from 1990 to 1993. Washington provided meaningful support only after the shift in strategy from peace enforcement to appeasement. Like the UN, the U.S. preferred a political solution that embraced rather than excluding the parties to the conflict. George Moose, Assistant Secretary of State for Africa in the Clinton Administration, stated in June 1993: "we do not believe a military solution is possible or desirable, but we realize that continuing pressure is an inescapable part of the equation for peace in Liberia."⁴⁶

The U.S. also objected to what it perceived as ECOMOG's partisanship. As result, in the early stage of the intervention the U.S. chose not to render support to enhance ECOMOG capacity to enforce peace, and refused to recognize the Amos Sawyer led IGNU, which it regarded as a Nigerian puppet and instrument of ECOMOG.⁴⁷ The U.S. did provide funding and logistical assistance to peacekeeping efforts during the early stage, but the support was clearly designed to reduce Nigeria's influence. Washington

⁴⁵ Adebayo, *Liberia's Civil War*, 57.

⁴⁶ Quoted in *West Africa*, no 3952 (21-27 June 1993): 1054.

⁴⁷ While ECOMOG's partisan relationship with anti Taylor rival factions was definitely a factor in the failure of the U.S. to provide decisive logistical and political support to ECOMOG in the early years of the intervention, the failure to separate her interaction with Nigeria on the Liberian conflict from her opposition to the domestic policies of the then Nigerian military government was no doubt a crucial influence in the decision to deny the Nigerian dominated ECOMOG such crucial support. However, there was no doubt that the U.S. was in the uncomfortable but understandable position of not wanting to be seen to be supporting ECOMOG while opposing the military government in Nigeria, especially after the June 12 election results were cancelled.

providing \$15 million for military equipment to Senegal, and wrote off \$45 million of its debt to the U.S., to facilitate its participation in ECOMOG operations in 1991. The U.S. also contributed \$19.8 million and another \$30 million in 1993 to the UN Trust Fund used to facilitate the participation of OAU troops from Uganda and Tanzania in 1993. From the end of 1991 to October 1993 the U.S. provided only about \$2.6 million to other ECOMOG contingents to meet their transport, communication, medical and fuel needs.⁴⁸

Similarly, the U.S. encouraged Ivorian President Houphouët Boigny to play a lead role in mediation efforts designed to overcome the stalemate in the peace process, which it believed arose from Taylor's loss of faith in the Nigerian dominated process.⁴⁹ This resulted in Houphouët Boigny's lead role in the regional mediation effort from 1991 to 1993, using the francophone dominated Committee Five.⁵⁰ This effort evolved through Yamoussoukro peace talks (I to IV). Within this period relative stability was experienced and Taylor's political position was significantly strengthened. Taylor took advantage of this to exploit and trade in the lootable resources in the territory under his control, thus boosting his war economy, enhancing his economic fortune, and strengthening his military capacity. However, Côte d'Ivoire's mediation effort failed with Taylor's breach of the cease-fire and attempt to seize power by force in Operation Octopus of October 1992. The aftermath of Octopus led to increased involvement of the UN in the conflict in 1993 and the tilt towards political accommodation of the warlords.

⁴⁸ "U.S. Policy in Liberia", *Hearing before the Sub Committee on Africa of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives*, 18 May 1994 (Washington, D.C: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995), 103.

⁴⁹ Note that the SMC, saddled with the mediation efforts was dominated by Nigeria, other anti Taylor Anglo phone states and Guinea. Doubt on the neutrality of the SMC especially by Franco member states undermined regional consensus and the legitimacy of the peace process. This stalemated the peace process. and necessitated the establishment of the Committee of Five. The committee was aimed at enhancing the mediation efforts and improving regional consensus.

⁵⁰ The Committee of Five was composed of Gambia, Togo, Senegal, Guinea – Bissau, and Cote d' Ivoire. It was tasked to work together with the non-governmental mediation group of former U.S. President, Jimmy Carter—the International Negotiation Network (INN) in monitoring the cease-fire, mediating between the various factions and guaranteeing security in the areas under their control. Clearly dominated by Franco phone member states, the committee focused more on diplomacy rather than military approach. Its approach which was perceived as favorable to Taylor, represented a major inroad by Franco phone member states, notably Cote d' Ivoire in the Nigerian-led Anglo phone dominated intervention. Within this period, the Committee of Five wrestled the intervention initiative from the Anglo phone dominated SMC.

2. Regional Political Dynamics

Political rivalry and acrimonious relationships divided the leaders of ECOWAS into pro- and anti-Taylor camps from the outset. Burkina Faso and Côte d'Ivoire supported Charles Taylor's rebellion against Liberia's President Doe from its inception. Sierra Leone, Guinea, Gambia and Ghana were generally seen to have been mildly anti-Taylor, largely in response to the escalating effects of the Taylor insurgency on the security of their countries. (The NPFL harbored dissidents from Sierra Leone, Guinea and Gambia). Nigeria's perceived hegemonic ambitions and the close ties between Nigerian President Babangida and Liberian President Doe marked Nigeria as staunchly anti-Taylor, and set it on collision course with its francophone rival Côte d'Ivoire, as well as with Burkina Faso. The peace enforcement intervention was further hobbled by these sub-regional divisions.

Burkinabé President Compaoré and Ivorian President Houphouët Boigny each provided bilateral support to Charles Taylor's rebellion. Compaoré's and Houphouët-Boigny's support for Taylor were motivated by personal interests as well as economic and strategic considerations. The former is believed to have assisted Taylor's forces with military training and the procurement of arms through Libya, while Côte d'Ivoire provided a staging post and route for arms supply and recruitment of Liberian fighters from along its border. For Houphouët Boigny, opposition to Doe was personal. Soon after the coup that brought him to power in 1980, Doe killed deposed President William Tolbert and his son Aldophous, who was married to Houphouët Boigny's niece. Compaoré, on the other hand, had a close personal relationship with Taylor. Taylor came to Ouagadougou, after Compaoré secured his release from a Ghanaian jail, at the time of Compaoré's coup in October 1988. Taylor later became President Compaoré's private security officer.⁵¹ Burkina Faso remained the main source of arms for the NPFL throughout the civil war, and Compaoré admitted in September 1991 that 700 Burkinabé soldiers assisted Taylor during the initial stage of the war. He benefited from trade with

⁵¹ Klass Van Walraven, "Containing Conflicts in the Economic Community of West African States: Lesson from the Intervention in Liberia, 1990-1997," *A Project Conflict Prevention in West Africa Paper*, Netherlands Institute of International Relations (January 1999), 33.

Taylor during the war, and hoped for continued strategic influence in a post-war Taylor-controlled government.⁵² With such overt support directed at dislodging Doe from power and delivering the Liberian state to their client, Burkina Faso and Côte d'Ivoire were set for collision with an ECOWAS intervention aimed at stopping Taylor's insurgency. The fact that the intervention was led by Nigeria and Guinea, both of which had historically strained relations with Côte d'Ivoire, only made matters worse.⁵³

Nigeria was the arrow head of the anti-Taylor actors. Prior to the onset of the Taylor insurgency Nigeria was a major ally and backer of the Doe regime. However, Nigeria's relations with Doe's Liberia were initially strained. In 1980 the civilian government of Nigeria refused to recognize Doe's military junta after the violent overthrow of the Tolbert government. President Doe was even prevented from attending the summit of the Organization of African Unity in Lagos that year. But all that was reversed by Military President Babangida, who became the main source of regional support for Doe, and allegedly supplied the Doe government with arms before the escalation of the conflict.⁵⁴ Therefore when Nigeria became a peacemaker in the conflict, it was naturally difficult for Charles Taylor and his sub-regional backers, who themselves had scores to settle with Doe, to see Nigeria as a neutral arbiter. Taylor consistently opposed the inclusion of Nigerian troops in the ECOMOG force and accused Nigeria of pursuing partisan interests.⁵⁵

Sierra Leone, Guinea, Gambia and Ghana who would constitute the body of the arrow had reason to be opposed to the Taylor insurgency from the onset. The recruitment pattern and composition of Taylor's NPFL sets it up for the opposition it received from these states. Taylor's fighting force included disaffected youngsters from all over the sub-region (especially from neighboring Sierra Leone, Gambia and Guinea) who found the NPFL a convenient platform to pursue grievances against regimes in their own

⁵² Adebayo, *Liberia's Civil War*, 55.

⁵³ Adebayo, *Liberia's Civil War*, 62.

⁵⁴ Adekeye Adebayo, "In Search of Warlords: Hegemonic Peacekeeping in Liberia and Somalia," *International Peacekeeping* 10, 4 (2003):68.

⁵⁵ Abiodun Alao, John Mackinlay, Funmi Olonisakin, *Peacekeepers, Politicians, and Warlords: The Liberian Peace Process*, (New York: United Nations University Press, 1999), 35.

countries⁵⁶ It was therefore not surprising that these states would support the ECOWAS intervention against the Taylor insurgency. Van Walraven suggests that Taylor demonstrated a kind of adventurism in pursuit of power that indirectly threatened all regimes in the sub-region. According to Babangida, "Taylor represents the kind of madness we all abhor and condemn."⁵⁷ Despite being insulated from the immediate fall out from Taylor's activities, Ghana too harbored anti-Taylor sentiments and encouraged an ECOMOG intervention. Taylor's NPFL forces attacked the Ghanaian Embassy and took some Ghanaians hostages on entering Monrovia in 1990. The invasion of Monrovia left in its trail a serious humanitarian disaster which Ghana condemned. Thereafter Ghana's Foreign Minister Obed Asamoah and General Emmanuel Erskine, former Ghanaian United Nations Force commander in Lebanon and a respected voice in Ghana, both called for ECOWAS intervention against the insurgency on humanitarian grounds and to contain the threat to regional stability.⁵⁸ Additionally, President Rawlings arrived in Banjul on 30 May 1990 for the first ECOWAS summit on the Liberian crisis with his military planners, including General Arnold Quainoo, who later became the first ECOMOG commander.⁵⁹ This suggests Ghana was also inclined to support military intervention against Taylor's insurgency from the onset.

3. ECOMOG Intervention and Attempt to Enforce Peace

a. The Intervention

Some fear that ECOMOG is an imperial excuse for Nigeria to interfere in the internal affairs of smaller states⁶⁰

Major General Maxwell Khobe

Former Nigerian ECOMOG Task Force Commander and Chief of Defense
Staff Sierra Leone Armed Forces

⁵⁶ Klass Van Walraven, *Pretence of Peacekeeping*, 65.

⁵⁷ Adebayo, *Liberia's Civil War*, 105.

⁵⁸ *Africa Confidential* 33, no. 23 (20 November, 1991): 7.

⁵⁹ Klass Van Walraven, "Containing Conflicts in the Economic Community of West African States: Lesson from the Intervention in Liberia, 1990-1997," 32.

⁶⁰ Maxwell Mitikishe Khobe, "The Evolution and Conduct of ECOMOG Operations in West Africa," <http://www.iss.co.za/Pubs/Monographs/No44/ECOMOG.html> accessed 16 December 2005.

At the thirteenth ECOWAS Summit in Banjul, Gambia, on 30 May 1990 Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Gambia, Guinea and Ghana pushed for an ECOWAS intervention. A Standing Mediation Committee (SMC), composed of Nigeria, Ghana, Gambia, Mali, and Togo, was set up and mandated to seek ways of resolving the Liberian conflict. The SMC subsequently adopted the IFMC peace plan and set up ECOMOG. However, and not surprisingly, there was not a sub-regional consensus on the decision to intervene. Burkina Faso and Côte d'Ivoire were in the forefront of the opposition, and the debate effectively balkanized the sub-regional body into Francophone and Anglophone blocs (with Guinea crossing over to the Anglophone bloc). The Francophone bloc argued that ECOWAS political and military intervention with ECOMOG was a violation of the ECOWAS Charter, which forbade interference in the internal affairs of member states.⁶¹ Burkina Faso refused to recognize ECOMOG, maintaining that the SMC was not competent to interfere in a member state's internal affairs and that the military conflict should be resolved by Liberians. The Francophone bloc also complained that the intervention had been presented to them as a *fait accompli* by the Anglophone bloc. As a result of the balkanization along language lines, Francophone Mali and Togo, original members of the SMC, ultimately declined to contribute troops, apparently after being persuaded by their francophone colleagues to back away. Francophone Senegal argued that an intervention in the name of ECOWAS should be referred to an extraordinary summit of ECOWAS Heads of State and government.⁶² Nevertheless, Nigeria rallied a coalition made up of Ghana, Guinea, Sierra Leone and Gambia, contributed the bulk of the troops and 90 percent of the funding and dispatched the ECOMOG to Liberia in August 1990. The deployment of ECOMOG to Liberia was approved three months later at the Bamako Summit.

Three warring parties existed at the time of ECOMOG's initial intervention: the AFL in support of Doe's government; Taylor's NPFL, and the Independent National Patriotic Front of Liberia (INPFL) a breakaway from the NPFL led by Prince Yormie Johnson. There was no cease-fire agreement among the warring parties and fighting was

⁶¹ The Protocol of Non-Aggression of ECOWAS, [http://www.iss.co.za/AF?RegOrg/unity to union/pdfs/ecowas/14PootNonAggre.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF?RegOrg/unity%20to%20union/pdfs/ecowas/14PootNonAggre.pdf) accessed 17 December 2005.

⁶² Adebayo, *Liberia's Civil War*, 64.

ongoing among all three. While the AFL and Prince Johnson welcomed ECOMOG's intervention, Taylor opposed the intervention and threatened to engage ECOMOG militarily. He particularly objected to Nigeria's dominant role in the force because of the relationship between Nigeria's President Babangida and Doe and questioned Nigeria's neutrality. Equally importantly, when ECOMOG deployed, Taylor was in control of over 90 percent of the country, had encircled the capital Monrovia, and was within a few kilometers of the Executive Mansion where an embattled President Doe was holed up. The ECOMOG intervention stood between him and victory. He made good his promise and attacked the intervening ECOMOG forces with coordinated artillery attack as it tried to move into position on the 24 August 1990.

b. Peace Enforcement

If a faction decides to take on us [sic] and challenge the peacekeepers, then the enforcement role comes in. We must make all factions comply with the collective wisdom of others...Then, we will return to our peacekeeping posture.⁶³

General Adetunji Olurin
ECOMOG field commander, 1992-1993

After the Banjul meeting of 30 May 1990, the SMC convened a national conference involving seventeen Liberian political parties, NGOs and other interest groups in Liberia to shape the direction of the resolution of the Liberian conflict. This met the aspiration of various civilian groups, which had earlier tried unsuccessfully to initiate such conference before the intervention of ECOMOG, including the unsuccessful IFMC attempt to mediate and broker a deal between Taylor and Doe in June 1990 at Freetown.⁶⁴ After the failed mediation attempt between Taylor and President Doe, Taylor shunned subsequent attempts at mediation. Consequently, the subsequent SMC convened national conference in Banjul nominated Amos Sawyer as the head of the Interim

⁶³ Adebayo, *Liberia's Civil War*, 119.

⁶⁴ Walraven, "Containing Conflicts in the Economic Community of West African States: Lesson from the Intervention in Liberia, 1990-1997," 35.

Government of National Unity (IGNU).⁶⁵ Taylor responded by establishing his own government called the National Patriotic Reconstruction Assembly (NPRA) with headquarters in Gbarnga, northern Liberia in October 1990 and intensified military attacks on ECOMOG and Monrovia in an attempt to seize power by force. Consequently, Nigeria pushed for enforcement actions to coerce Taylor to comply with the peace plan. The enforcement action was opposed by the Francophone bloc in ECOWAS and by the UN and U.S., but Nigeria again pressed ECOMOG forward.

The first attempt at peace enforcement which was codenamed Operation Liberty commenced 1 October 1990 and lasted for 3 weeks. It sought to secure Monrovia as a safe haven from Taylor's continued military assault. It was undertaken by Nigeria's General Nimyel Joshua Dongoyaro as a limited offensive operation. In this ECOMOG collaborated with the AFL and the INPFL in routing the NPFL from the capital-Monrovia. The enforcement action was directly challenged by Côte d'Ivoire and Burkina Faso, which attempted (unsuccessfully) to halt it by calling for a summit of heads of state at Yamoussoukro in mid October 1990.⁶⁶ The offensive was eventually halted prematurely, on the intervention of Malian President Mousa Traore who reportedly prevailed on upon Babangida to halt the offensive having secured assurances from Taylor that he was prepared to negotiate an end to the conflict and the establishment of an interim government at a peace conference scheduled for November in Bamako, a proposal to which he had previously objected. The enforcement action realized its immediate objective of securing Monrovia as a safe haven and creating a buffer zone around the city. It forced Taylor to abandon Monrovia to ECOMOG. ECOMOG also captured Spriggs Payne Airport located within Monrovia and the port of Buchanan bordering the Atlantic in Southwest of Liberia from the NPFL. This stemmed the flow of arms import to the NPFL through these facilities. The enforcement action compelled Taylor to acquiesce to cease-fire and the Bamako Peace Agreement of November 1990.

⁶⁵ Communiqué of the National Conference of All Liberian Political Parties, Patriotic Fronts, Interest Groups and Concerned citizens: Banjul The Gambia, August 27-September 1 1990, text in Official Journal of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), November 1992.

⁶⁶ Van Walraven, *Containing Conflicts in the Economic Community of West African States: Lesson from the Intervention in Liberia, 1990-1997*, 47.

It also enabled the relocation of the Amos Sawyer led IGNU from Banjul to Monrovia and secured stability that lasted until October 1992.⁶⁷

Evidently, the enforcement action was succeeding and ECOMOG was anxious to press on with its initial military success to achieve military victory but for the diplomatic intervention that halted it. General Dongoyaro said following the halting of the offensive that the “whole thing would have been finished a long time ago, but political considerations are naturally superior to military decisions.”⁶⁸ His request for 2-3 more battalions to complete the tasks of establishing a cease-fire across Liberia was denied by Babangida, who apparently acquiesced to political pressure from some ECOWAS heads of state to halt the offensive.

Had the enforcement action continued with regional/international support, ECOMOG’s initial military success, which saw Taylor’s abandoning Monrovia and losing strategic facilities and acquiescing to a cease-fire, would likely have culminated in bringing the conflict to an end, which would have eliminated the need for ECOMOG’s recourse to patronizing rival factions. Neighboring borders that provided conduit through which illicit arms and lootable resources were channeled in and out could have been closed (this was key to the UN operations later), and while smuggling of diamonds and guns may not have been totally eliminated because of the difficulty neighboring countries have controlling their own territories, it certainly would have been reduced.⁶⁹ This would have minimized the economic incentive that drove the conflict.

However, in line with the apparent preference for a political solution by other regional and key international actors, Houphouët Boigny, with the U.S. support, assumed the lead role in the regional mediation effort that followed from 1991 to 1993. But this only further complicated the speedy resolution of the conflict as it set the Francophone and Anglophone blocs on competing strategic courses. The negotiation efforts (Houphouët Boigny’s) led to Yamoussoukro I to IV peace talks. The negotiations

⁶⁷ Nkem Agetua, *Operation Liberty: The Story of Major General Joshua Nimyel Dongoyaro* (Lagos: Hona Communications, 1992):81-87; Magyar, 59.

⁶⁸ Quoted in Adebayo, *Liberia’s Civil War*, 80.

⁶⁹ Note UN sanctions on arms and blood diamond targeted against the warlords and international logistical and financial support extended to ECOMOG particularly from the U.S and EU towards the end of the ECOMOG operation were critical facilitating factors in the resolution of the conflict.

undermined and in fact reversed the gains of the enforcement action and reinforce Taylor's position. Yamoussoukro 1 of June 1991 called for the IGNU and NPRAG to provide security in areas under their control until elections for a post-conflict government were held. This minimized the Amos Sawyer led IGNU because it provides legitimacy for Taylor's parallel NPRAG government.⁷⁰ Taylor was quick to announce that Yamoussoukro I did not recognize Sawyer's IGNU as the only legitimate government in the country. This *de facto* recognition of dual administrations effectively partitioned the country into two, with the IGNU controlling Monrovia and the NPRAG controlling the rest of the country.⁷¹ This gave Taylor, who had been forced to abandon Monrovia and acquiesce to the Bamako Ceasefire Agreement, an opportunity to legitimately exploit the lootable resources in areas under his control unhindered and to strengthen his bargaining position.

The halting and subsequent reversal of the gains of the peace enforcement action set the stage for the emergence of new factions. The United Liberation Movement of Liberia (ULIMO) emerged on 29 May 1991 with the aim of "freeing Liberia from Taylor's plunder."⁷² ULIMO was widely seen as a creation of ECOMOG to counter the renewed NPFL challenge facilitated by Côte d'Ivoire. ECOMOG was no doubt driven to the unsavory strategy of propping up ULIMO by the equally unsavory strategies (less obviously so) of Houphouët and other Taylor backers. The effects of competition between pro- and anti-Taylor actors in the sub-region clearly highlight the extent to which success was undermined by the lack of regional/international cooperation in the effort to end the Liberian conflict. With such cooperation ECOMOG could have called upon peacekeeping troops to impose order rather than being forced to rely upon militias to undermine Taylor after other ECOWAS member states had fortified him. The unraveling of the peace enforcement gains, and the refusal of ECOMOG to accept the

⁷⁰ Bekoe, 265.

⁷¹ Note that although NPRAG was not recognized internationally by external governments, Taylor's intransigence was strengthened by ECOWAS's recognition of the NPRAG under Côte d'Ivoire leadership and the NPRAG's consistent control of over ninety percent of Liberia's territory. This was exacerbated by IGNU's inability to extend its influence and authority beyond Monrovia, a result of ECOMOG inability to deploy beyond Monrovia in the early phase of the intervention.

⁷² *West Africa*, no 3825(24-30 June 1991):1537.

alternative being pursued at Yamassoukro, encouraged Taylor to attempt once again to take Monrovia militarily through Operation Octopus. Operation Octopus involved simultaneous NPFL attacks on Monrovia and key ECOMOG positions in October 1992. ECOMOG responded with a second enforcement action in January 1993.⁷³

Led by Nigeria's General Abacha Abacha, the second enforcement action (which ECOMOG regarded as a defensive operation like the first enforcement action) was prosecuted in collaboration with anti NPFL factions - the AFL and new entrant ULIMO. It involved aerial bombardment of Taylor's strategic and economic assets, including the Roberts International Airport (used by Taylor as an entry point for arms supplies), the Firestone Plantation (a key economic asset, which Taylor exploited to boost his war economy), the Buchanan Port (used by Taylor as a loading point for illegal exportation of iron ore, timber and rubber), and the highway town of Kakata (a key supply route). Once again the offensive was halted prematurely by regional and international pressure and criticism of ECOMOG's decision to wage war in league with rival warring parties against the NPFL.⁷⁴ Nevertheless, the incomplete offensive had reduced Taylor's control of Liberian territory from 95 percent to 50 percent, as ULIMO took control of most of northwestern Liberia including the strategic Bong mines, and also cut the NPFL off from its Revolutionary United Front (RUF) allies in Sierra Leone.⁷⁵ The loss of territory, strategic and economic assets reduced Taylor's access to arms and profiteering from his war economy. With this Taylor's military and economic position was again significantly weakened. No longer in a position of strength, Taylor once again returned to the negotiating table.

In the eyes of many ECOMOG was partisan in the application of the enforcement action, and as a result credibility as a neutral party and in fact came to be regarded as a warring faction itself. Herman Cohen, then U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for Africa, declared that, "ECOWAS had ceased to be a neutral party, and had become one of the

⁷³ Van Walraven, *Pretence of Peacekeeping*, 38.

⁷⁴ Adebayo, *Liberia's civil War*, 123-127.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

combatants.”⁷⁶ Regionally, opposition came not only from Taylor’s backers, but also from Nigeria’s key ally, Ghana. Although the Ghanaians had participated in ECOMOG from the beginning and were initially opposed to allowing Taylor to take power through violence, like the U.S. they never really supported ECOMOG’s targeting of one party to the conflict in its peace enforcement actions. Instead they now favored a negotiated solution that would accommodate rather than exclude Taylor, having come to believe that the solution to the Liberian crisis could only come from Taylor, the chief protagonist. Koffi Totobi Quakye, Ghana’s information Minister, said at the time: “Ghana is anxious to find areas of compromise. Compromise lies in the hands of Taylor. There is a Nigerian passion to annihilate Taylor. Charles Taylor is aware of [sic] the Ghanaian way of doing things is more accommodating and is looking more at the way of achieving the end of having an election.”⁷⁷ The failure to effectively enforce peace in the early stage of the intervention led to Ghana’s 1993 conclusion that peace could not be achieved outside a political arrangement that embrace Taylor.

In spite of the opposition and criticisms, like the first enforcement action, the second attempt at peace enforcement sufficiently demonstrated that with regional and international support, ECOMOG would have been able to implement a military solution to the conflict. However, as was the case with the early halting of first enforcement action, the situation again tilted back towards mediation efforts, with the introduction of the UN and OAU into the mediation process leading to the Cotonou Agreement of July 25, 1993. Like the Bamako Agreement, it offered the warlords political opportunities which undermined ECOMOG’s military gains and encouraged the emergence of new factions. New factions, including the Liberian Peace Council (LPC) and the Loma

⁷⁶ Quoted in Ramcharan, B G, “Cooperation between the UN and Regional Organization in Internal Conflicts: The Case of Liberia,” *African Yearbook of International Law* (1997): 8.

⁷⁷ Quoted in *African Report* 38, no.4 (July/August 1993): 3 .

Defense Force (LDF), sprang up in the competition for control of territory, exploitation of lootable resources and to gain inclusion in the peace deal. This further complicated the resolution of the conflict.⁷⁸

The emergence of these new groups triggered renewed fighting amongst factions, which led to massive refugee flows into Guinea and Côte d'Ivoire, raising concerns about potential regional destabilization. Gradually, Houphouët Boigny's concerns about Côte d'Ivoire's own national security weakened his support for Taylor.⁷⁹ However, by that time it was clear to all that ECOMOG's effort to forcefully implement a peace plan that would have marginalized the warlords had failed.

In retrospect it is clear that peace enforcement presented the "best" course of action in the Liberian circumstance. Violence and instability would continue to plague Liberia until Taylor was finally forced from power and into exile in 2003. Taylor had no incentive to accept any initial peace plan that offered him no significant political benefit, and in this circumstance, such a plan only stood a chance if ECOWAS enforced compliance militarily. Efforts to implement the peace plan on premises other than enforcement were clearly doomed, or as Amos Sawyer, Liberia's first interim government chairman, put it, too optimistic.⁸⁰ However, the successful implementation of ECOMOG's enforcement action depended on international support and regional consensus, which was absent. This exacerbated ECOMOG's situation and constrained her to resort to patronage and alliance with anti NPFL forces. The alliance contributed significantly to the evident gains of ECOMOG's peace enforcement actions against the NPFL (Taylor's capitulation and the shrinking of his military and economic preponderance and loss of strategic and economic assets which forced him back to the negotiating table). The gain of the enforcement actions highlights the critical facilitating

⁷⁸ The LPC was led by former ULIMO political committee chairman George Boley and was composed largely of Krahn refugees from Côte d'Ivoire and former members of Doe's AFL and, like ULIMO, it enjoys covert support from ECOMOG. The LDF, on the other hand, was a rival Mandingo faction opposed to the Alhaji Kromah led Mandingo dominated ULIMO-K. The LDF was headed by Francois Massaquoi and enjoys the support of Taylor.

⁷⁹ *African Concord* 7, no. 28 (30 November 1992):7.

⁸⁰ Sawyer, 41.

factor which regional consensus and international support would have been to ECOMOG's efforts to resolve the conflict in its early stage.

4. Transition to Appeasement

Liberia's cycle of violence has its foundation in the policy of appeasement in which the warlords, responsible for many atrocities, assumed political power without mechanisms to ensure peace-building.⁸¹

The foundation for the strategic shift from enforcement to appeasement of the warlords was laid with the direct involvement of the UN and the OAU in the conflict. After his appointment in October 1992 as the Special Representative of the UN Secretary General in Liberia, Trevor Gordon-Somers began conferring with West African political leaders on a potential UN contribution to the Liberian peace process. The OAU showed similar inclination with the appointment of Reverend Canaan Banana as the OAU Eminent Person to the Liberian crisis in January 1993. Against this background and with the ECOWAS increasingly prepared to abandon its failed peace enforcement strategy, Benin President and ECOWAS chairman Nicephore Soglo began working toward a larger UN role. Thus under the joint chairmanship of the UN, ECOWAS and the OAU, UN-financed and organized peace talks were held in Geneva from 10-17 July 1993. An agreement worked out at those talks was signed in Cotonou, Benin on July 25 1993. The Cotonou Agreement marked the genesis of the "power for guns" policy by which international negotiators sought to accommodate the armed factions with offers of access to significant state power.⁸² The shift to the UN, marked by the UN/Benin brokered accord, came at a time when Nigerian President Babangida was distracted by a domestic political crisis that lingered from June to November 1993 and eventually led to his removal from power. This was a critical facilitating factor in the easing of Nigeria's previous hard line posture on enforcement and exclusion of the warlords.⁸³

⁸¹ Thomas Kamara, "Liberia: Civil War and Regional Conflict," *UNHCR WRITENET Paper No/17*, <http://www.writenet@gn.apc.org> accessed on 17 December 2005.

⁸² C A Alao 'Commentary on the Accords', in *Accord: An International Review of Peace Initiative*, 1, (1996): 70; Samuel Kofi Woods, 'Civil Initiative in the Peace Process', in *Accord: An International Review of Peace Initiative*, 1 (1996): 29.

⁸³ Klass Van Walraven, "Containing Conflict in the Economic Community of West African States," 56.

The Geneva peace talks accorded the warlords significant influence in the formulation and content of the Cotonou Agreement.⁸⁴ This was a departure from previous arrangements where agreements were decided by ECOWAS member states dealing with the civil society -led interim government. The Cotonou Agreement proposed a new transitional government, to be known as the Liberian National Transitional Government (LNTG), composed of a 5 member executive council of state and a 35 member legislature in which the rebel factions would be represented alongside the IGNU. Thus, the IGNU was reduced from a government to a faction. The council of state was to be made up of representatives of the two largest rebel factions (NPFL and ULIMO), the IGNU and 2 civil society representatives.⁸⁵ The 35 member legislature would be composed of representatives of the IGNU and Taylor's National Patriotic Reconstruction Assembly Government (NPRAG), in addition to 9 representatives of ULIMO. The LNTG was to be in place by August 1993 with a presidential election following 7 months later. Despite giving the warlords a greater role in the LNTG, Cotonou retained the initial peace plan's caveat that the warlords would be ineligible to contest the elections if they took up council membership. It was thus not yet an offer of warlord peace. (Factional leaders choose to send representatives to the council so that they would remain eligible to contest the elections). Nevertheless, because Cotonou accorded the warlords, particularly Taylor, respite and the legitimacy that came with involvement in the formulation and content of the Agreement, they saw it as a welcome development and readily embraced it. Cotonou was a major departure from the previous peace plan in that it shielded the warlords from prosecution for war crimes and human rights abuses by granting a general amnesty. Additionally, it expanded ECOMOG to include troops from non-West African OAU countries as a means of enhancing ECOMOG's credibility and acceptability with Taylor.

⁸⁴ Klass Van Walraven, "Containing Conflict in the Economic Community of West African States," 56.

⁸⁵ The LPC and LDF that emerged after Octopus were conspicuously left out in the Cotonou arrangement. This omission would later haunt and militate against the peace progress.

Finally, it introduced the United Nations Observer Mission in Liberia (UNOMIL) with 368 observers. ECOMOG saw UNOMIL as a watch dog deliberately introduced to placate Taylor.⁸⁶

ECOWAS' strategic shift to the political accommodation of the warlords thus began with the Cotonou Agreement. Although the primary cause of the shift was the failure of peace enforcement, which I have argued was due primarily to insufficient regional and international support, changes of government in Nigeria and Côte d'Ivoire at the end of 1993 were significant contributing factors. Both of the new presidents, Sani Abacha in Nigeria and Henri Konan Bédié in Côte d'Ivoire had more serious domestic political problems to contend with than had their predecessors and were therefore less interested in what one analyst describes as an "uncertain foreign adventure."⁸⁷ In addition, Abacha faced a dramatically different economic situation from that faced by Babangida when he initiated the Liberian intervention. In the early 1990s Nigeria had been awash in oil revenues as a result of the Gulf War windfall. By the end of 1993, the windfall was over. Abacha had to contend with a crippling pro-democracy oil strike that virtually paralyzed the country for 9 weeks between July and September 1994. For the better part of his administration he also suffered international isolation and sanctions as a result of his coup d'état and subsequent poor human rights record, including most notably the hanging of environmental activist Ken Saro Wiwa.⁸⁸ He was therefore compelled to focus on consolidating power at home. Bédié too did not have the personal stake in the Liberian conflict as Houphouët had. As a result of all of this, the change in governments in Nigeria and Côte d'Ivoire provided both countries the opportunity for save facing while doing what needed to be done.

In this context, and frustrated with the lack of progress in the peace talks and the heavy financial burden on Nigeria, at the OAU summit at Tunis on 13 June 1994 Abacha indicated his intention to withdraw from Liberia barely eight months after taking over power. According to the then UN Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, "Nigeria

⁸⁶ Van Walraven, *Containing Conflict in the Economic Community of West African States*, 56.

⁸⁷ Adebayo, *Liberia's Civil War*, 132-135.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

specifically said that it would have to withdraw its contingents unless a solution could be found to the problem.”⁸⁹ By November 1994 Nigeria had reduced its troop strength in Liberia from 10,000 to 6,000, and withdrawn all its heavy military equipment. Ghana also expressed its frustration with the lack of progress with the peace talks and threatened to withdraw its peacekeepers. On February 8 1994 Ghanaian foreign ministry announced that Ghana would withdraw 900 peacekeepers from ECOMOG within thirty days if progress was not made with the talks. The same threat was repeated by Ghana’s foreign minister at the June 1994 OAU summit in Tunis.⁹⁰ With the failure of peace enforcement, continued intractability of the conflict and the escalating refugee influxes into their countries (100,000 into Côte d’Ivoire and 60,000 into Guinea between September and October 1994), neighboring Côte d’Ivoire, Guinea and Sierra Leone, also began supporting the option of political accommodation of the warlords.

C. CONCLUSION

In the absence of credible international response to the onset of the Liberian conflict, Nigeria led the push for ECOWAS political and military intervention. But the intervention was handicapped from the beginning by regional political division, rivalry and lack of consensus. The intervention was further undermined by the peace plan itself which was rooted on a faulty premise. It presupposes Taylor would easily acquiesce to the plan, the absence of which necessitated recourse to the enforcement. ECOWAS’ attempt to achieve peace through enforcement and political exclusion of the warlords diverged with other regional actors and international interests who preferred a political solution in which the warlords played significant political roles. Subsequent ECOWAS enforcement (pushed largely by Nigeria) which was carried out in alliance with rival factional groups against the NPFL was opposed and criticized by others involved in the peace process as partisan, in spite of the obvious Taylor’s intransigence which constituted a serious impediment to the successful implementation of the peace plan. In the end,

⁸⁹ Adebayo, *Liberia’s Civil War*, 132-135.

⁹⁰ Clement Adibe, “The Liberian Conflict and the ECOWAS-UN Partnership,” 479.

ECOWAS attempt to enforce compliance with the peace plan failed, and it gave way to the tilt towards the political accommodation and appeasement of the warlords.

Peace enforcement was abandoned largely for reasons that had nothing to do with an assessment of the “best” approach to resolving the problem in Liberia. It would have accomplished what was minimally required for a lasting peace and a real democratic post-conflict government if it had succeeded, and it had a real chance of succeeding if it had been given support internationally and regionally. Thus ECOMOG failed in its attempt to enforce peace primarily because it failed to exact regional consensus and international support, a key requirement in multinational peace effort involving regional organization rather than a major world power or the UN.

III. NEGOTIATING WARLORD PEACE

A. INTRODUCTION

With the failure of peace enforcement accepted by all, including Nigeria, strategy shifted towards finding a political solution that embraced the warlords. This chapter discusses the process by which the warlords were legitimated as political leaders and argues that the process led to end state of a warlord peace. It further argues that the focus on warlord peace undermined the implementation of the crucial security provisions of the agreement, which later became significant in the subsequent flawed implementation of Abuja II. It begins by tracing the process by which the warlords were legitimated as political leaders and how it culminated in Abuja II. It identifies and explains the flaws in the design of Abuja and the failure to implement its security provision before the termination of the transitional government.

B. LEGITIMATING THE WARLORDS (1994 -1996)

Despite the shift in strategy, peace continued to be elusive, and new armed groups formed to compete for control of territory, both for the purpose of extracting economic resources and to gain inclusion in the peace deal. The LNTG also proved to be largely ineffective, failing to extend its authority beyond Monrovia. This was so largely because the factional representatives in the LNTG had little influence over the factions they claimed to represent. Additionally, several factional representatives, mostly of the NPFL, defected from their factions once they got into the Council, seeking to establish themselves as independent power brokers.⁹¹ As a result, they lost all influence in the field, and the LNTG was therefore unable to persuade the factions to comply with the peace plan, especially on the issue of disarmament.⁹² Whether disarmament should precede or follow the installation of a new interim government remained a contentious issue among regional actors and the factions. While Nigeria, the IGNU and the weaker factions insisted on total disarmament prior to the installation of the new interim

⁹¹ Notable among these was Tom Woewiyu, former NPFL defense minister who formed a parallel breakaway faction-the central Revolutionary Committee of the NPFL(CRC-NPFL).

⁹² Van Walraven, 58.

government, others, including Taylor insisted that the new interim government comprising the factional leaders oversee the disarmament. It was in this circumstance that required the restarting of the mediation process in 1994, this time led by Ghana.

1. Akosombo and the Appeasement Strategy

Recognizing that the factions would not disarm because it was not in their interest to do so, Ghana maintained that the warlords would have to be lured with a bigger political prize to give up their guns. The LNTG would have to be a powerful interim administration to make it attractive as a medium through which the warlords could realize their political objectives.⁹³ Ghanaian Deputy Foreign Minister Mohammed Ibn Chambers argued that “in order to achieve effective disarmament one has to engage and deal directly with the leaders who own and control the various factions.” He supported the idea of direct inclusion of warlords in the Council, while allowing them to remain eligible for election, and also the idea of a new interim government preceding disarmament.⁹⁴ This contrasted sharply with the Nigeria’s position that a new interim government would be more effective if it was preceded by disarmament. That is if the warring parties were first convinced to disarm before setting up a new interim government.⁹⁵ Basically Ghana was suggesting that ECOWAS should do whatever is needed to move the peace process forward if it was obvious that disarmament before elections could not be achieved. Thus another step was taken toward warlord peace.

President Rawlings brokered the Akosombo Agreement of September 1994 with the leaders of then Liberia’s major factions, Charles Taylor (NPFL), Alhaji Kromah (ULIMO-K), and General Hezekiah Bowen (AFL).⁹⁶ The Akosombo Agreement,

⁹³ Van Walraven , 60.

⁹⁴ E K Aning, “ECOWAS and the Liberian Crisis-An Analysis of Ghana’s Role in Liberia,” *Liberian Studies Journal* 2 (1996): 282-283.

⁹⁵ Adebayo, *Liberia’s Civil War*, 159.

⁹⁶ The exclusion of new power blocks--Francois Massaquoi of Loma Defense Force (LDF), George Boley (LPC) Roosevelt Johnson (ULIMO-J) and Tom Woewiyu (CRC-NPFL) would later constitute a major cause of the failure to implement Akosombo and the subsequent Accra Clarification. Akosombo did not reflect the military and political reality on the ground. At the time of the signing Akosombo both Taylor and Kromah had been expelled from their headquarters in Gbarnga and Tubmanburg respectively by new power blocks. Like Yamoussoukro and Cotonou, factions excluded from peace talks continue to play spoiler roles to secure seat in Council.

witnessed by UNSGSR Trevor Gordon-Somers, provided for the direct inclusion of faction leaders in the power-sharing Council of State, without disqualification from contesting future elections. This had been a key demand of the warlords, who wanted to be directly represented in the Council and allowed to supervise the disarmament of their own factions. Thus, Akosombo laid the foundation of the policy of appeasement. The Agreement provided for a new five member Council of State composed of the three faction leaders, a representative jointly nominated by Taylor and Kromah, and a fifth member to be nominated by the Liberian National Council, a civil society organization.⁹⁷ The Council of State would have a rotating chairman and two vice chairmen. Akosombo also entrusted the LNTG with responsibilities for implementation of the security provisions of the agreement, specifically the responsibility of planning for the restructuring and training of the AFL, the Liberian National Police and other security forces with assistance from ECOWAS, UNOMIL and friendly countries.⁹⁸ Additionally, the LNTG was also to share joint responsibilities with ECOWAS and UNOMIL to conduct disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of all warring factions. The restructuring and training of the AFL and other security forces constituted the most critical and sensitive section of the security provision. It was contained in articles 6, 9 and 12 of the agreement (Appendix A). Article 6 of the agreement authorizes the LNTG to initiate the process of establishing appropriate national security structures, including a properly constituted AFL. Article 9 of the agreement specifically emphasizes that the AFL should be restructured and the planning for its restructuring and training would be the responsibility of the LNTG with assistance from ECOMOG and UNOMIL. It further emphasized that the AFL be restructured to reflect the ethnic and geographical balance of the country. Article 12 outlined some assisting roles of ECOMOG and UNOMIL and warned parties against creating obstacles that would impede the full implementation of the security provisions of the agreement.

⁹⁷ Like Cotonou, Roosevelt Johnson, George Boley, Tom Woewiyu and François Massaquoi were left out in the power sharing arrangement of Akosombo. This would once again come to haunt the peace process.

⁹⁸ "The Last Straw for Peace or Total Anarchy," *West African Network for Peace-Building WANEP* (June 4, 2003) http://www.wanep.org/warn_policybrief_Liberia_historic.htm accessed on 17 May 2006.

With this, Akosombo handed over the implementation of the peace agreement, including the crucial security provisions of restructuring of the armed forces and disarming of the factions, to the warlords. A satisfied Taylor exclaimed after the agreement that “when the three of us [Taylor, Kromah and AFL leader Bowen] say there will be no more war in Liberia, there will be no more war.”⁹⁹ Liberia’s civil society organizations and political class saw Akosombo as an attempt to install a military junta. The Liberian National Conference questioned the rationale for replacing the existing interim government led by civil society representatives with a government of warlords after ECOMOG had struggled for four years to prevent such outcome. Additionally, faction leaders that were left out in the Akosombo arrangement, including Roosevelt Johnson, George Boley, Tom Woewiyu of the Central Revolutionary Committee of the NPFL (CRC-NPFL) and Francois Massaquoi of Loma Defense Force (LDF) also opposed Akosombo. Nigeria and ECOWAS Secretary General Edouard Benjamin also complained of a lack of consultation.¹⁰⁰

Akosombo would be amended with the Accra Clarification of November 1994 to include factions that were initially left out, but not to accommodate civil society concerns. However, like Akosombo, the Accra Clarification was never implemented as hostilities between the warring parties continued unabated. Smaller/weaker parties, motivated by fear of domination by the stronger/larger factions, continued to haunt the peace process. With the deadlock unaffected by the latest agreements, the peace train moved to Abuja in 1995.

2. Abuja I & II: Adopting the Appeasement Strategy

With the failure of Akosombo and Accra, Rawlings ceded the diplomatic lead to Nigeria. The first step in the final resolution was facilitating rapprochement between Abacha and Taylor. It was generally believed that if common ground could be reached between them, the deadlock could be broken and the crisis resolved. The exit of Babangida and Houphouët Boigny depersonalized the conflict and removed a critical

⁹⁹ Quoted in *West Africa*, no.4016 (19-25 September 1994):1637.

¹⁰⁰ Adebayo, *Liberia’s Civil War*.

obstacle to reaching a regional consensus. Abacha calculated that resolution of the intractable Liberian crisis would be good for his battered image both domestically and internationally. He was therefore predisposed to the overture by Taylor to find common ground, especially as it was encouraged by the U.S. and various international stakeholders, including Côte d'Ivoire and Burkina Faso.¹⁰¹ Taylor's first meeting with Abacha, in Abuja on June 2 1995, was considered a historic breakthrough. This rapprochement was instrumental to Nigeria's dramatic U-turn toward accommodating Taylor. With Nigeria position altered, opposition to Akosombo/Accra and continuing criticism from the civil society within Liberia and the region was insufficient to block warlord peace. The 1995 Abuja I Agreement reaffirmed and adopted the Akosombo and Accra agreements, and essentially transformed the Council of State into a Council of Warlords. It accorded the warlords full political legitimacy by actualizing their direct involvement in the council for the first time in the peace process. It expanded the Council to six members, comprising the three most powerful warlords (Taylor, Kromah, and now George Boley of the LPC) and three civilians (Tamba Tailor, Oscar Quiah and Professor Wilton Sankawulu) representing the civil society and other interest groups. Although the warlords could not head the council directly, they could nominate its chairman. Accordingly, they nominated Sankawulu. Other faction leaders (including Roosevelt Johnson, Hezekiah Bowen, Tom Woewiyu, and Francois Massaquoi) were accommodated in the LNTG in ministerial capacities. The agreement also called for disarmament and elections by January and August 1996 respectively. By this arrangement Abuja I accommodated the warlords that had made Akosombo and Accra unworkable. It was quite ironic that the final appeasement strategy would be negotiated in Abuja, given Nigeria's long and lonely campaign to avoid precisely this outcome. ECOWAS described the arrangement as the "most appropriate arrangement for durable peaceful settlement to the Liberian crisis."¹⁰² Nevertheless, it was clear from the outset the arrangement was driven by expedience. As Amos Sawyer, Liberia's first interim

¹⁰¹ *African Confidential* 36, no 12 (9 June 1995):8.

¹⁰² Final Communiqué of ECOWAS Meeting on Liberia, Abuja, August 1996.

government chairman, later noted: “the assumption that [the] power sharing arrangement unmonitored and without credible threats of sanction (enforcement) would hold, proved to be too optimistic.”¹⁰³

The council of warlord’s arrangement manifested several weaknesses that would contribute to the fragility of post-conflict peace and stability. First, it accorded the warlords considerable powers and influence over the civilian leadership of Council, which they exploited to promote their interests. “Power was carved up between Taylor, Boley and Kromah in a tactical alliance that had nothing to do with patriotism, peace or democracy.”¹⁰⁴ With no army to balance the warlords’ militias, the civilians in the council were powerless. Secondly, the political empowerment of the warlords undermined ECOWAS’ political oversight and minimized ECOMOG’s power to the point that the warlords called for the signing of a Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA) that would put ECOMOG under their control.¹⁰⁵ The power-sharing arrangement allocated government departments to Council members, who appointed their loyalists to oversee them. Consequently, sensitive departments such as the Liberian National Police came under Taylor’s control, a situation he exploited to pack the police force with his former militias. The only threat to the power of the warlords under this arrangement came from the warlords themselves, and rivalry among them in advance of the presidential elections significantly weakened the Council. All these factors contributed to the April 6 crisis which threatened to derail the Abuja peace process.

Charles Taylor and Alhaji Kromah, acting in a rare alliance in their capacities as Council members ordered the Rapid Response Unit (RRU) of the national police, supported by their own militias, to arrest fellow warlord Roosevelt Johnson on charges of murder on April 6, 1996.¹⁰⁶ Against all advice from Abuja, Accra, Washington and the

¹⁰³ Sawyer, 41.

¹⁰⁴ Max Ahmadu Sesay, “Politics and Society in Post War Liberia,” *Journal of Modern African Studies* 34 no. 3 (1996):403.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶ Under the power sharing arrangement, appointees of the warlords ran government ministries and departments allocated to their faction. Accordingly, the Liberian National Police (LNP) which was allocated to the NPFL was dominated by the NPFL. Taylor reportedly recruited over 800 ex NPFL fighters into the LNP, including Joe Tate--former NPFL chief of police, who was appointed as the director of LNP.

OAU, Taylor vowed to bring the full force of the law to bear on Roosevelt Johnson.¹⁰⁷ Predictably, Johnson resisted arrest and whipped up ethnic tensions by suggesting that Taylor was making a final attempt to eliminate the Krahn ethnic group from the power sharing coalition. George Boley, a fellow Krahn, immediately abandoned the Council of State and joined forces with Johnson.¹⁰⁸ Fierce fighting between NPFL and ULIMO-K militias, on the one hand, and ULIMO-J (Roosevelt Johnson's faction), the AFL and LPC (George Boley's) militias on the other hand ensued.¹⁰⁹

This factional violence led to the collapse of Abuja I, and threatened to derail the peace process once again. However, the crisis was ultimately resolved in one last round of talks in Abuja in August 1996 which resulted in the Abuja II Accord. In spite of the obvious weakness in the council of warlords' political arrangement, the ECOWAS Ministerial Council of the Committee of Nine on Liberia reaffirmed the Abuja I framework, with some modifications (Appendix B). The most significant modification was the establishment of a new six-member council to be headed by a new chairperson, former Liberian senator Ruth Perry, with all the warlords in the council functioning as vice presidents with equal status. The implementation timetable was extended by nine months and elections scheduled for 30 May 1997.¹¹⁰ Another major modification was the incorporation of a sanctions regime, including prohibition from running for elective office and persecution by war crime tribunal for anyone who violated Abuja II, designed to prevent any new breach of the agreement (Appendix C).

3. Restructuring the Security Forces

From the beginning, these agreements represented the best hope for permanent peace and reconciliation. But the accords were never comprehensively enforced by ECOMOG due to pressure from ECOWAS regional leaders and the international community to have a quick-fix solution to the Liberian problem. The accords were implemented in a

¹⁰⁷ Sesay, 403.

¹⁰⁸ Sesay, 404.

¹⁰⁹ Adebayo, *Liberia's Civil War: Nigeria, ECOMOG and Regional Security in West Africa*, 188.

¹¹⁰ The election was eventually postponed to 19 July 1997.

piece meal fashion on the false and faulty logic that elections would eventually lead to peace and reconciliation.¹¹¹

Following the April 6 crisis, the ECOWAS Ministerial Committee of Nine on the Liberian called for the return to the 1995 Abuja Peace Agreement and requested for the “verifiable disarmament by all factions along with the creation of new Armed Forces of Liberia on a non-tribal basis with contributions of personnel from all factions.”¹¹² This call was restated in the eight meeting of the ministerial committee which held at Abuja from 15-17 August 1996 wherein the need to restructure the security forces to restore their credibility and create a sense of security amongst the citizenry in post election Liberia, was stressed. It stated thus:

The meeting expressed grave concern that security agencies in Liberia have deep factional affiliations and in particular, the police had been infected with fighters and unqualified personnel at the highest possible level. This state of affair had eroded the confidence and sense of security in the citizenry. (Paragraph 54)

With a view to establishing a credible security apparatus for post-election Liberia, the meeting endorsed the proposal to restructure the armed forces, police and other security institutions to reflect geographical and ethnical balance. (Paragraph 55)¹¹³

This recommendation was adopted by ECOWAS heads of state and government. Despite this recognition of the need to de-factionalize, de-ethnicize, and restructure the security forces before the elections of July 1997, virtually nothing was accomplished during the pre-election period. This failure set post-election Liberia up for exactly the outcome ECOWAS had sought to forestall. What accounted for the failure to implement the crucial provision on the restructuring of the security forces?

First, restructuring the security forces was really not a priority of ECOWAS or the international community. With the slide into murderous anarchy in the April 6 crisis, a weary ECOWAS adopted the position of the international community, which was to end

¹¹¹ Quoted in “Taylor’s Liberia Army,” <http://www.the perspective.org/restructuring.html> accessed on May 17 2006.

¹¹² Text in *Official Journal of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)*, Volume 22, Special Edition, 1997, 92.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 106.

the conflict by whatever means necessary. Officially, elections were viewed as a workable strategy of speedy resolution of the conflict. In practice, they provided an exit strategy for Nigeria, ECOWAS, and the international community. One Western diplomat noted: “Sani Abacha ... wants to get out of Liberia. To do that, he has to find a workable end-game strategy, which will have to involve elections.”¹¹⁴ The international community saw the restructuring of the AFL a necessary part of the peace process, but it was more concerned with elections. Support from the U.S. and European Union to ECOWAS and Liberia after the April 6 were basically logistical and technical assistance to the Independent Electoral Commission (IEC) to boost its capacity to conduct of the elections, and for ECOMOG to facilitate deployment throughout the country to provide election security. International support to INGOs and NGOs took the form of humanitarian relief for displaced persons and refugees. Liberians, fully aware they were being abandoned to the warlords, were in no position to compel the international community to do what it did not consider a priority. One Liberian noted: “They are paying the money and providing security for us, if we insist on one thing they can only fund the other.”¹¹⁵ The revised schedule of implementation addresses elections exclusively, with no reference whatsoever to the restructuring of the security forces (See Appendix D).¹¹⁶ The 1996 revised schedule was consequent upon the collapse of Abuja I and by implication the 1995 Schedule of Implementation.

The warlords themselves had every interest in postponing the restructuring of the security forces until after the elections. Restructuring was thus not on the agenda of the warlord dominated Council. Faction leaders in the Council concentrated their efforts on the elections, transforming the factional frameworks into political parties. The stronger among them sought to use their superior military strength to consolidate their positions,

¹¹⁴ Quoted in Howard W French, “Liberia, Life Returns to Grim Normality,” *New York Times*, August 21, 1996, A8.

¹¹⁵ In *The Analyst*, “No Restructuring, No Elections,” available at http://www.analystnewspaper.com/no_restructuring_no_elections_joe_wylie.htm accessed 30 January 2006.

¹¹⁶ While it can be argued that omission might have been influenced by the reason of the deference of the responsibility of the restructuring of the security forces to the LNTG, it should also be noted that it was not a responsibility designed to be implemented in isolation.

while the weaker among them felt the need to maintain their militias as a security guarantee, especially after the lessons learnt from the April 6 crisis.

Insofar as Articles 9 and 12 of the Agreement cede responsibility for initiating the restructuring of the security forces to the Council, with ECOWAS and the UN in assisting roles, restructuring of the armed forces was dead on arrival. An earlier attempt by Sankawulu, chairman of the 1995 Council, to address the issue of the restructuring of the security forces was blocked by the warlords who were more interested in using the Council to further their presidential aspirations.¹¹⁷ A similar tendency was manifested in the 1996 Council. Oscar Quiah one of the three civilian members of the 1996 Council noted that serious dialogue on key issues of the peace process was blocked by the three warlords.¹¹⁸ With the consolidation of warlord power in the 1996 Council, there was no impetus whatsoever towards reform. Although ECOMOG repeatedly raised the issue of restructuring with ECOWAS, there is no evidence that ECOWAS prompted the Council, or that the Council initiated any restructuring at all.¹¹⁹ It was understood that successful implementation of the Agreement depended on the goodwill and cooperation of the warlords, and ECOWAS was not prepared to upset the apple cart on the issue of restructuring the armed forces.¹²⁰ It was now determined to bring the conflict to resolution even if that resolution was a warlords' peace.

B. CONCLUSION

Following the abandonment of its military and political strategy which sought to enforce peace and alienate the warlords politically while patronizing the civil society, ECOWAS attempted to create a compromise solution that balanced warlord and civil society powers. In the process it lost leverage over the warlords, and was therefore unable to negotiate a compromise settlement that included civil society in any meaningful way. The warlords seized the initiative, dominated and secured agreements that were largely in

¹¹⁷ Adebayo, *Liberia's Civil War*, 183.

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

¹¹⁹ *Africa News*, 9/26/03, "Taylor's Asylum Obasanjo's Greatest Mistake Says Former Peacekeeping Commander Malu," <http://www.publicinternationallaw.org> accessed on 20 December, 2005.

¹²⁰ Terrence Lyons, 3.

their favor and assumed ownership of the transitional governments. Through the 1995 Abuja I to 1996 Abuja II Accords, which were ostensibly compromises and appeasement to elicit the cooperation and compliance of the warlords in order to move the peace process forward, the warlords were placed in the driver's seat in the implementation of the peace agreement and they drove straight to warlord peace. Although Abuja II was largely an adoption of the 1995 Accord, whose failure portrayed its flawed nature, it might still have led to a lasting peace had its security provisions been fully implemented. Regrettably, it was not simply because regional and international actors wanted to get out and the July 1997 special election which was seen as a convenient exit strategy. The failure to restructure the security forces provided the incentive structure for the eventual flawed implementation and the partisan application of the security forces by the Taylor government, which in turn led to a return to war.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

IV. THE FLAWED IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SECURITY PROVISIONS OF THE ABUJA AGREEMENT AND THE RESUMPTION OF WAR IN 1999

A. INTRODUCTION

Chapter II showed that ECOWAS' 1990-1993 peace enforcement strategy was undermined by an absence of international support and regional consensus. Chapter III showed that ECOWAS' 1994-1996 strategy of compromise with the warlords faltered because ECOWAS now had no leverage over the warlords, and was therefore unable to negotiate a compromise settlement that included civil society in any meaningful way. Having finally accepted warlords peace, largely as an exit strategy, ECOWAS produced the Abuja II Accord, a seriously flawed peace agreement, but one which might still have led to a lasting, if unjust, peace had it been fully implemented. This chapter will show that the failure to implement the crucial security provision of the agreement as stipulated virtually guaranteed a speedy return to war. The chapter is divided into two parts. The first part discusses Taylor's electoral victory and failure to implement the security provisions of the Abuja Agreement after the 1997 elections, and the premature exit of ECOMOG from Liberia. The second part traces the process by which the flawed "restructuring" of the security forces contributed to the resumption of war in 1999.

B. TAYLOR'S ELECTORAL VICTORY, RENEGING ON ABUJA AND THE EXIT OF ECOMOG

1. Taylor's Electoral Victory

Charles Taylor won the July 19, 1997 special elections which marked the end of Liberia's six -year war in a landslide with 75 percent of the vote of the total votes cast. His closest opponent, current Liberian President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, secured 10 percent of the vote.¹²¹ Although the opposition contested Taylor's electoral victory, international observers, UNOMIL and ECOWAS certified the credibility of the

¹²¹ Terrence Lyons, "Liberia's Path from Anarchy to Elections," *Current History* (May, 1998): 4.

election.¹²² However, the imbalance that existed in Liberia's political, resource and military topography (created by six years of war) prior to the election clearly favored Taylor, suggesting that the election was conducted on an unlevel playing field.

Indications that the election would be favorable to Taylor were evident from the beginning. While other political parties and civic organizations pressed for delay in the elections from the initial scheduled date of 30 May 1997 as a result of the extremely tight time and resource constraints they faced, Taylor and ECOMOG (which was determined to get out of Liberia immediately after the election) continued to call for adherence to the 30 May 1997 scheduled date. Eventually ECOWAS agreed to delay until 19 July 1997 (a mere two months delay). Prior to the election Taylor had far greater resources and better organization than other competitors, particularly Johnson Sirleaf, who had only just returned from exile. Furthermore, the decision to allow factional leaders to transform their factions into political parties, and failure to get Taylor to give up resources he illegally acquired during the war, clearly favored Taylor relative to other contestants. Consequently, the NPFL, which Taylor quickly converted into a political party-National Patriotic Party (NPP), transformed into an effective mass mobilizing political party which provided a ready-made structure. The booty from his war economy was also handy in the boosting of his electoral kismet. With the material benefits from his illegally acquired wealth he was able engage extensively in political patronage and extensive campaigns.¹²³

Another important factor in Taylor's electoral victory was fear. The issue of peace was central in the election. During campaigns Taylor's opponents pointed to his violent past but could not propose viable actions to contain him in the event that he lost and refused to accept defeat. With disarmament and demobilization incomplete, ECOWAS' apparent failure to muster the political and military consensus necessary to effectively contain Taylor, and the reiteration of its intention to leave quickly after the election, voters were left with no alternative than to vote for Taylor in order to maximize the chances of peace and stability. Statements like "Taylor killed my Pa, He killed my Ma,

¹²² Terrence Lyons, "Liberia's Path from Anarchy to Elections," *Current History* (May, 1998): 4.

¹²³ He acquired new land rovers, buses, motorcycles, trucks in a country with few vehicles which were mostly rickety. He was also able to lease a helicopter. (he was the only candidate that used a helicopter throughout the campaigns).

but I will vote for him,”¹²⁴ attributed to Liberians during the election, showed how the fear of a Taylor defeat shaped voters views of the election and the choices available to them.

From this one can only conclude that the election institutionalized the pre-election imbalance, placing Liberia on the quick sands of the return to war. In the end Taylor’s rise to power was ratified, not by war or a power-sharing arrangement, but by an internationally, regionally, and locally accepted the process of election. Thus, warlord peace was fully legitimized, suggesting that the use of election on the quick as a workable end game strategy was a recipe for disaster.

2. Reneging on Abuja and Exit of ECOMOG

Once the founding election is held and third party withdraws its troops, a new situation prevails. At that point, the rules and institutions previously insisted upon by the weaker parties in an effort to reduce minority uncertainty about their future role in the country’s political life may no longer be binding.

Donald Rothchild¹²⁵

Even before he was inaugurated on August 2 1997, Taylor indicated that he would not live up to the commitment he had made in the Abuja Agreement by declaring that ECOMOG would leave Liberia six months (February 2 1998) after the inauguration of his government.¹²⁶ In November 1997, anxious to establish his presidential authority, he formally reneged on Abuja's provisions on the restructuring of the security forces, declaring that it was his constitutional responsibility to restructure the AFL and no longer was the responsibility of ECOMOG, adding that Liberia would not allow foreign troops to train its army.¹²⁷ While Taylor’s actions were clearly inconsistent with the provisions of Abuja, his claim to constitutional authority can hardly be disputed, especially since there was nothing in Abuja to indicate that the commitment was designed to be binding

¹²⁴ Terrence Lyons, “Liberia’s Path from Anarchy to Elections,” *Current History* (May, 1998): 4.

¹²⁵ Rothchild, “Assessing Africa’s Two-Phased Peace Implementation Process.”

¹²⁶ “Politics-West Africa: Whither Peacekeeping in Liberia,” *Inter press Services*, 30 November 1997.

¹²⁷ Home Office Country Assessment: “Liberia,” Country Information and Policy Unit, March 1999 http://www.asylumlaw.org/docs/liberia/ind99_liberia_ca.pdf, section 3.7., 18.

on the post-war government. This highlights Rothchild's postulation quoted at the beginning of this section and reiterates the need for effective third party implementation of sensitive provisions of agreement.

General Malu acceded to Taylor's renunciation of Abuja, stating that ECOMOG was prepared to leave as soon as the Liberian government convinced ECOWAS that it was able to assume full responsibility for its security.¹²⁸ Although Taylor later altered his position on ECOMOG's quick exit from Liberia, he insisted on a review of ECOMOG role, maintaining that ECOMOG's mission must change by February 2, 1998. He requested the redeployment General Malu from Liberia and the downsizing of ECOMOG to a capacity building force that would work with the Liberian government in the maintenance of security. But the suggestion that the force would be under the authority of the Liberian Ministry of National Defense, with himself as the commander-in-chief, was not acceptable to ECOWAS. Clearly, no country would be willing to contribute troops under such conditions. General Malu was replaced in January 1998, and by February 1998 all national contingents had left Liberia, except Nigeria and Ghana, which retained only skeletal troop levels. This downsizing at the behest of President Taylor put paid to issue of the restructuring of the security forces by ECOMOG.

Prior to the July 1997 elections ECOMOG was deployed all over the country with a troop strength of about 10,500, and functioned as the key military force responsible for the provision and maintenance of security for the state, the government, opposition forces, and the population at large. Taylor's rejection of the security provisions of the Abuja Agreement, and call for the early withdrawal of ECOMOG forces thus raised security concerns locally and internationally. These concerns were compounded by the prospect that ECOMOG would be replaced by ex-rebels. Civic leaders and the diplomatic community viewed ECOMOG departure as premature, arguing that it portended danger given the fragile security environment in the country. U.S. President Bill Clinton called for the maintenance of a peacekeeping force as a guarantee for stability, noting that ECOMOG departure would create a dangerous security vacuum that would affect

¹²⁸Home Office Country Assessment: "Liberia," Country Information and Policy Unit, March 1999 http://www.asylumlaw.org/docs/liberia/ind99_liberia_ca.pdf, section 3.7., 18.

regional stability.¹²⁹ The Catholic Archbishop of Monrovia, Michael Francis, expressed similar fears about the security implications of the exit of ECOMOG, telling the Liberian Senate that “the majority of the people of Liberia do not have trust or have confidence in the present security forces. They have implicit confidence in ECOMOG.”¹³⁰

The sense of insecurity that Taylor’s action elicited was intense given the continuing mistrust among the former warring parties, which was itself attributable in large part to the hasty implementation of the Abuja Agreement in the transition period. Feeling that the election was conducted prematurely, in an atmosphere of inadequate security and on an unlevelled playing field that favored Taylor, opposition leaders (and former military adversaries) Alhaji Kromah and George Boley rejected Taylor’s electoral victory and accused the electoral commission and ECOMOG of perpetuating fraud.¹³¹ Already the warlords’ peace was beginning to unravel, and an apolitical security force was desperately needed. Tensions were increasing among the warlords, and the UN/ECOWAS conducted disarmament, demobilization and re-integration of combatants program remained incomplete.¹³² The LNP, dominated by former NPFL militia, was becoming the dominant local security force, increasing fears among the other warlords that Taylor intended to use the LNP to maintain his post-war advantage over them.

In this context, civil society groups and Taylor’s archrival Roosevelt Johnson protested the decision to renege on the Abuja Agreement and called on ECOWAS to stand firm.¹³³ Johnson, former leader of ULIMO-J and then Minister of Rural Development in the Taylor government, insisted that the restructuring of the army and other security forces be implemented fully according to the Abuja Peace Accord, anticipating the return to conflict that would follow from failure to do so. “Under the Abuja Accord, the ECOWAS intervention force, ECOMOG, is to restructure the new

¹²⁹ Home Office Country Assessment: “Liberia,” Country Information and Policy Unit, March 1999 http://www.asylumlaw.org/docs/liberia/ind99_liberia_ca.pdf, section 3.7., 18.

¹³⁰ Ibid., 14.

¹³¹ Lyons, 5.

¹³² “Malu Regrets Leaving Liberia Without Restructuring Liberian Army,” *Pan African News Agency*, 9 January 1998.

¹³³ Johannes Z Zlahn, “Is the Abuja Accord Which Produced the July 19, 1997 General Elections a Binding and Enforceable Contract?” *New Horizon Journal Boston* (January/February/March 1999): 4.

army. But Taylor said it is his constitutional right to decide who restructures the army. We see what is happening, but we try to exercise restraint and remain silent for the better and good [sic] of our people.”¹³⁴ Alhaji Kromah, leader ULIMO-K faction, also warned that Taylor’s reneging on the restructuring of the security forces by a neutral body portended trouble, and promptly went into self-imposed exile. On December 9 1997 Taylor appointed him chairman of the National Committee on Reconciliation, but he refused to return to the country to take up the appointment, citing fears for his safety. This is clear evidence of the escalation of fears of vulnerability that Taylor’s reneging on the Abuja Agreement elicited.¹³⁵

C. THE FLAWED RESTRUCTURING OF THE SECURITY FORCES AND THE RESUMPTION OF WAR

The downfall of Taylor’s government was his failure to restructure the security forces.

Daniel Chea, Taylor’s defense minister¹³⁶

Edwin Snowe, Charles Taylor’s son in law and former NPFL stalwart now a Senator of the Republic of Liberia, attributed Taylor’s proliferation of multiple para-military structures and the marginalization of the AFL to accommodate the Anti Terrorist Unit (ATU) as the critical factors motivating the insurgency that eventually led to the fall of the Taylor government.¹³⁷ This is consistent with the justification advanced by the Liberians United for Reconciliation and Democracy (LURD) insurgency that triggered Liberia’s second civil war in 1999. LURD ascribed the rebellion against the Taylor government to Taylor’s failure to allow the international community to restructure the AFL, the partisan “restructuring” of the AFL and despotic manner in which Taylor used the police and newly created security forces composed of his former NPFL militias to run

¹³⁴ “Former Warlord Insists on ECOMOG Restructuring of the Army,” *Pan African News Agency*, 16 February 1998.

¹³⁵ Home Office Country Assessment, 18.

¹³⁶ “AFL Must Restructure Before the Elections-Defense Boss,” *African News*, May 18, 2005.

¹³⁷ “Petroleum; Snowe Renders Apology,” *African News*, 24 September, 2004.

others out.¹³⁸ General Victor Malu's lamentation after Liberia's return to war also lends credence to the role of Taylor's flawed implementation of the restructuring of Liberia's security forces to the return to war in 1999. General Malu posited that the restructuring of the security forces as stipulated in the agreement would have led to post-war stability because it would have enhanced the credibility of not only the armed forces but also of the government itself. "Prior to the elections, we had eight factions and they were transformed into political parties. The idea was to form an army acceptable to all the people and not just a section, a clan, or tribe. This is necessary to ensure confidence in the elected government."¹³⁹

Soon after his inauguration Taylor began his own "restructuring" of the AFL. In November 1997, he announced the formation of a 1,000 man force, which would form the nucleus of a "new" AFL. Most of these were drawn from his militias.¹⁴⁰ He maintained that Liberia's national security and economic realities did not warrant the maintenance of then existing 15,000 strong AFL.¹⁴¹ In January 1998 he issued a special presidential order to demobilize and retire 2250 AFL personnel on the grounds of old age, and went ahead to constitute a 27 member AFL Presidential Restructuring Commission to complete the process.¹⁴² This move generated tension amongst the Krahn and Mandingos, who were disproportionately affected by the demobilization.¹⁴³

Faced with dilemma of the practical political impossibility of eliminating the Krahn and Mandingos from the army, and retaining an army whose loyalty was

¹³⁸ General Cobra, LURD Deputy Chief of Staff, in "Liberia: An Uncivil War," A documentary film directed by Jonathan Stack and James Brabazon, released 24 May 2004.

¹³⁹ Tom Kamara, "Liberia: Can Peace be Consolidated,"¹⁷, a UNHCR Centre for Documentation and Research Paper, July 1999.

¹⁴⁰ The new AFL turned out to be the newly created ATU, made up of Taylor's ex-militias. The ATU was likened to Doe's elite Special Anti terrorist Unit (SATU) preceding the war, which was exclusively composed of Krahn. The legality of the ATU remained controversial and was contested by officials of the Ministry of Defense who claimed that the ATU which was not created by an Act of parliament and worst still was not under their control of the ministry. The ATU like Doe's SATU became the elite arm of the AFL and enjoyed considerable government patronage, while the AFL was marginalized and neglected.

¹⁴¹ Toure, 22. AFL strength shot up from a pre-war strength of 6,500 to 14,981 (mostly Krahn) during the war.

¹⁴² Although Taylor insisted the ATU was part of the AFL, it was excluded from the "restructuring" exercise of the AFL Restructuring Committee.

¹⁴³ *African Confidential* 40, no 4 (19 February 1999):7.

questionable at best, Taylor resorted to the gradual demobilization and marginalization of the AFL itself. He limited the role of the AFL in the provision of national security and set up parallel security outfits tasked with overlapping functions in the coordination of national security. These multiple security outfits were all personally loyal to him.¹⁴⁴ The new forces were drawn largely from his wartime militia made up of former rebels and mercenaries from various West African states. They included the Strike Force, ATU, Special Security Unit, Alert Force Republican Guard, Counter Force and the Special Operation Division (commanded by his son).¹⁴⁵ By 2001, with about 4000 personnel demobilized and the AFL reduced to a marginal role in the security of the state (the central role having been gradually taken over by the elite ATU since 1998), the AFL had almost ceased to exist.¹⁴⁶ A high ranking ministry of defense official lamented that this situation was the fulfillment of Taylor's grand design to "keep the AFL weak, under-funded and on the periphery of national security."¹⁴⁷

Taylor's "restructuring" of the security forces sought to accomplish precisely what Abuja had sought to prevent, but it was a pragmatic response to the prevailing security threat that confronted him at the time. On assumption of office Taylor was confronted with a Krahn dominated "national army" (AFL) that remained opposed to his leadership and strongly linked to his arch rivals, former Krahn warlords Roosevelt Johnson (ULIMO-J) and George Boley (LPC). In late 1995 eight of the 11 leadership positions in the AFL were held by ethnic Krahns.¹⁴⁸ Having inherited the army that had opposed him throughout the war, Taylor acted to eliminate the AFL threat and to consolidate his hold on to power. In the process, he quickly confirmed the fears of vulnerabilities expressed by former adversaries and political opponents. The abduction and eventual killing of opposition politician and former Taylor loyalist Samuel Dokie and members of his family on December 1, 1997, allegedly on the orders of Taylor's chief

¹⁴⁴ United States Department of State, *Country Report on Human Rights Practices 2002: Liberia*, Washington, DC, 31 March 2003.

¹⁴⁵ Kamara, "Liberia: Can Peace be Consolidated," 15.

¹⁴⁶ "Mano River War," *The Liberian Post*, <http://Liberian.tripod.com/Post25.html> accessed on 14 August 2006, 5.

¹⁴⁷ Toure, 22.

¹⁴⁸ Sesay, 415.

bodyguard, confirmed fears of Taylor's intention to use the security forces against former adversaries. Five members of the state security service arrested in connection with the murder were released for lack of evidence.¹⁴⁹ With the targeting of political opponents and growing insecurity, prominent opposition leaders continue to move out of the country. Defeated presidential candidates including former warlord George Boley and opposition politician Ellen Johnson Sirleaf took refuge in the U.S. Tension flared between Roosevelt Johnson and Taylor's security forces in December 1997 and again in August and September 1998. Johnson finally took refuge in the U.S. embassy and was evacuated from the country, eventually taking up exile in Nigeria. On November 12 1998 Taylor accused 32 people, including exile opposition leaders Alhaji Kromah, Roosevelt Johnson, George Boley and Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, of treason. After a trial in Monrovia, most were convicted, some in absentia.¹⁵⁰ Had the restructuring been accomplished in the transition period in accordance with the provisions of the Abuja Accord, ethnic balance would have been achieved, the army depoliticized, and the impetus for Taylor's interventions reduced.

The exodus of opposition politicians and Taylor adversaries from Liberia, which commenced with Taylor's rejection of Abuja and the exit of ECOMOG, grew as Taylor employed security forces to eliminate rivals. The exodus reached its peak with the January 1998 attempt to retire and demobilize mostly Krahn and Mandingo AFL personnel. A significant number of those seeking refuge in Guinea, Sierra Leone and Côte d'Ivoire were ex-AFL and LNP personnel. Krahn and Mandingoes withdrew en masse from Liberia's political and military structures, claiming harassment, betrayal and assassination at the hands of Taylor's security forces. The death under mysterious

¹⁴⁹ Sam Dokie was a co-founder of the NPFL. He broke ranks with Taylor during the civil war to form the NPFL-CRC with Tom Woewiyu. He remained a prominent post-war political opponent of the Taylor government. He and his abducted family were last seen in the custody of the SSS. In spite of the fact that Benjamin Yeaten, Taylor's chief bodyguard and SSS boss admitted involvement, Taylor exonerated the state from the murder.

¹⁵⁰ United States Department of State, *Country Report on Human Rights Practices 2002: Liberia*, Washington, DC, 31 March 2003.

circumstances of former ULIMO-J Brig-Gen Mana Zeki greatly exacerbated the feeling of insecurity and further encouraged emigration to the safety of neighboring states, particularly Guinea and Côte d'Ivoire.¹⁵¹

In April and August 1999, Liberian dissidents, who called themselves Liberians United for the Restoration of Democracy (LURD), invaded Voinjama and Kolahun, in Lofa County of northern Liberia. In early 2003, a second faction in Côte d'Ivoire emerged as the Movement for Democracy in Liberia (MODEL), opening another front in the insurgency against Taylor from the south eastern part of the country (Appendix E). The 1999 invasion began Liberia's second civil war. LURD consisted of mainly Mandingo and Krahn ex-service personnel of the AFL and LNP who claimed they were wrongfully removed from service and replaced with Taylor's militias.¹⁵² MODEL, whose fighters were also composed mainly of former AFL and LNP personnel, articulated similar grievances.¹⁵³

D. CONCLUSION

The effective implementation of a peace agreement, particularly of elements that addresses the security concerns of parties to a conflict was critical to the sustainability of post-war peace. As anticipated in the theoretical literature, the mistrust and fears of vulnerabilities that characterize negotiated settlements, left unaddressed during the transition period of a peace process, undermined post-conflict stability in Liberia. ECOWAS and the international community in their bid to end Liberia's war acceded to warlord peace at the cost of the failed implementation of the very critical and sensitive provision of the restructuring of Liberia's security forces that might have stabilized that peace. By this the transition process of Abuja II created the incentive structure that Taylor simply responded to. The provision to de-ethnicize and de-factionalize Liberia's security forces before the elections of July 1997 was designed to forestall exactly this

¹⁵¹ James Brabazon, Liberia: "Liberians United for Reconciliation and Democracy (LURD)," the Royal Institute for International Affairs Briefing Paper no. 1 (February 2003): 2, www.CHG.org/pdf/research/atna/brabazon%70bppdf, accessed 1 September 2006.

¹⁵² General Cobra, in "Liberia: An Uncivil War."

¹⁵³ "Liberia: Security Challenges," *International Crisis Group*, Report No 71 (3 November, 2003): 11.

outcome. Warlord peace, which Abuja anticipated would achieve a peaceful resolution of Liberia's intractable civil war, was in the end no more successful than peace enforcement had been.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

V. CONCLUSION AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Sustainable post-conflict stability, peace and security remain the foundation on which post-conflict reconciliation and reconstruction rest. Motivated by the phenomenal rise in the instability of negotiated settlements in the 1990s, this thesis set out to answer the general question of what determines the sustainability of post-war peace. It found a consensus in the theoretical literature that effective and comprehensive implementation of peace agreements, particularly of elements that address the security concerns of parties to the conflict, is critical to the sustainability of post-war peace. Nevertheless, this consensus had not been tested in the case literature on Liberia, and so I sought to determine whether the nature of the peace agreements and their implementation were critical factors in the failure of the negotiated settlement in Liberia in 1996. The evidence shows that they were.

Security guarantees were particularly important in Liberia given the country's peculiar political antecedents. The history of Liberia's political development shows a pattern of partisan composition and application of the security forces by successive governments as instrument for the perpetuation of state-driven violence and promotion of individual, group and ethnic interests. As observed by an analyst "Liberia's security forces have historically served as an instrument of partisan rule, first, defending the interests of the Americo-Liberian oligarchy, and then keeping the autocratic regime of Doe in power."¹⁵⁴ The requirement for the restructuring of Liberia's security forces to reflect ethnic and geographical balance before the emergence of the post-election government of 1997 was aimed at addressing the security concerns of parties to the conflict. This was recognized to be especially important in light of the critical influence of the issue of security in the body polity of Liberia in general and the mutual suspicion and rivalry that characterized the transition process from 1990 to 1996. The reluctance of the warlords to disarm their militias due to ongoing security concerns and the subsequent failure of Abuja following the outbreak of April 6 crises clearly lends credence to costs of

¹⁵⁴ Adedeji Ebo, "The Challenges and Opportunities of Security Sector Reform in Post-Conflict Liberia," *Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF), Occasional Paper-9*, December 2005.

not having a restructured professional security force in place. Regrettably, at the termination of the transition process with the special elections of July 1997 in which Charles Taylor emerged victorious, the security forces had not been restructured as envisaged in Abuja. Post-election Liberia was thus set up for exactly the outcome ECOWAS initially sought to forestall. In the end the misuse of the security forces which triggered the civil war that brought Taylor to power ultimately led to the civil war that eventually removed him from power and plunged Liberia into yet another round of bloodletting and political instability.

This thesis demonstrated that a causal relationship exist between the failure to implement the security provisions of the 1996 Abuja II Accord and Liberia's return to war in 1999. It showed that the failure of 1996 LNTG, ECOWAS and the international community to ensure the implementation of the security provisions of Abuja created the incentive structure for the flawed implementation by the post-war Taylor government which became the primary cause of Liberia's return to war in 1999. Liberia's return to war in 1999 has important implications not only for the current security stabilization and reform efforts in Liberia, but also to the understanding of the role of agreement implementation in the stability of negotiated settlements elsewhere.

A. IMPLICATIONS FOR CURRENT SITUATION

The restructured force shall take into account the country's national balance. It shall be composed without any political bias to *ensure that it represents the national character of Liberia*.¹⁵⁵

While the failure of Abuja showed that regional consensus and international support are critical to the successful implementation of a peace agreement where the third party implementing agent is a regional organization/regional lead nation and not the United Nations or a major world power, the return of Liberia to war in 1999 clearly indicates that the effective implementation of a peace agreement, particularly of elements that address the security concerns of parties to a conflict is critical to the sustainability of post-war peace. It also showed that effective third party leverage and equilibration of power and

¹⁵⁵ Quoted from Part Four, Article V11 (2b) of the *Accra Comprehensive Peace Agreement* of 19 August 2003.

vulnerability among contending parties to a conflict and civil society actors are critical in the negotiation and implementation of a peace agreement. Finally, it highlights the need for the consolidation of peace beyond conflict termination tied to elections.

Although, presently Liberia has successfully transited to a post-war democratically elected government, the consolidation of peace through stability and reconstruction efforts is still ongoing. Ostensibly, the international community did not take for granted the critical lessons derived from the failure of Abuja and Liberia's return to war in 1999 in its implementation of the 2003 Accra Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) with the Byrant Liberia National Transitional Government (LNTG) of 2003-2005. From the beginning the International Contact Group on Liberia (ICGL), the initiators and facilitators of the peace talks that ended the war engaged in extensive consultations with key local, regional and international actors. This resulted in the peaceful resignation of President Taylor and formulation of the CPA which signaled the end of Liberia's second civil war in 2003. It also laid the foundation that facilitated the overwhelming regional consensus and international support that greeted the U.S. supported Nigerian led ECOMIL vanguard force.¹⁵⁶

Leverage was also secured for civil society actors both in the formulation and implementation of CPA. Thus Chairman Byrant, with the support from the regional and international community wielded executive powers throughout the transitional government period. No warlord was given the opportunity to wield any significant power to compromise the power and vulnerability balance.

The recognition that the restructuring of the security forces of Liberia was vital to the stability of post-conflict Liberia was evident in the CPA and calls by Liberians that the implementation of the security provision to be accorded priority. The security provisions of the CPA states that in restructuring the AFL national balance should be taken into consideration to ensure that the AFL new command structure be composed to reflect the national character of Liberia without any political bias. It also requested that ECOWAS, the UN, AU, and the ICGL provide advisory staff, equipment, logistics and

¹⁵⁶ ECOMIL Vanguard Force preceded the deployment of the UN International Stabilization Force (UNMIL) in October 2003.

experienced trainers for the security reform effort. It specifically requested that the United States of America plays a lead role in organizing this restructuring program.¹⁵⁷

Apparently to forestall the incentive structure pitfall that Abuja fell into, Chairman Byrant consistently called on the U.S. and international community to meet the commitments on the restructuring of the security forces before the termination of the transitional government. Others also made similar calls. Lawrence G. Gowan, a Liberian analyst, warned on the need for effective implementation of the commitment on the restructuring of the security forces before the transition to post-war governance. He warned that it was likely that after the 2005 elections the CPA would cease to have legal value in Liberia, placing the elected government under no obligation to obey it, since successive Liberian governments have hardly demonstrated the political will to be impartial in the composition of post-war security forces. He wondered why the issue of the restructuring of the security forces was considered secondary to the 2005 election in the implementation of Accra after what Taylor did to ECOMOG and Abuja after his inauguration as an elected president in 1997. Similarly, Major General Joe Wylie, former LURD senior military adviser and later Liberia's Deputy Defense Minister in Bryant's government of 2003-5 warned that the administration of the post-Byrant LNTG stands endangered if the LNTG and international community did not ensure that the AFL as envisioned in the 2003 Accra CPA, was restructured to a professional army which would serve the interest of the Liberia people rather than the interest of a few individuals in power as was the case with Abuja.¹⁵⁸

Although the restructuring of Liberia security forces was not completed before the 2005 election and inauguration of the current Johnson Sirleaf government, the current collaboration between the Sirleaf government, the U.S., and Nigerian governments as well as the UN in the ongoing restructuring and security sector reforms efforts in Liberia indicate that the implications of Liberia return to war in 1999 was not lost to the

¹⁵⁷ Quoted from Part Four, Article V11 (1b) of the *Accra Comprehensive Peace Agreement* of 19 August 2003.

¹⁵⁸ "Liberia; No Restructuring, No Elections, Warns 'Maj Gen' Joe Wylie, *The Analyst, African News* (March 30, 2005) <http://www.nexis.com/new/frame>, accessed 14 September 2006.

international community, particularly the need for consolidation of peace beyond conflict termination tied to elections (election as an exit strategy).¹⁵⁹

So far Liberia has enjoyed three years of post-election stability and there are no indications that post-war stability of Liberia would not be enduring. This is informed by the manifestations on the ground which shows that the international community is at last heeding to the calls for the departure from the futility of warlord peace and elections as an exit strategy and embracing the wisdom of effective third party implementation and consolidation of peace beyond conflict termination tied to elections.

¹⁵⁹ Note that the U.S. through a U.S. based security firm -DynCorp is spearheading and sponsoring the restructuring of Liberia's security forces, while a Nigerian general is currently the head of the army undergoing restructuring.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX A: SECURITY PROVISIONS OF THE AKOSOMBO AGREEMENT SEPTEMBER 1994

SECTION E

Article 6:

“The parties further mandate the LNTG to begin the formation of appropriate national security structures to facilitate the disarmament process. Accordingly, appropriate measures shall be undertaken to enable AFL to assume its character as a national army. Until such measures are completed the AFL like all other parties and warring groups shall be completely disarmed in accordance with the Cotonou Agreement.”

SECTION H

Article 9:

“Internal security arrangements, including police, customs and immigration, will be put in place immediately. Planning for restructuring and training of the AFL will be the responsibility of the Liberian National Transitional Government, with assistance of the ECOWAS, the United Nations and friendly nations.”

SECTION K

Article 12

“The attached schedule of implementation to be attached to this agreement including disarmament, encampment and demobilization of combatants, preparation of the status of forces agreement, restructuring of the AFL and dissolution of the parties drawn up by ECOMOG and UNOMIL in collaboration with parties, shall be given to each parties prior to implementation. The parties undertake that they will create no obstacle to the full implementation of any foregoing activities.”

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX B: REAFFIRMATION OF THE 1995 ABUJA AGREEMENT¹⁶⁰

Paragraph 28

The Abuja Agreement (1995) was designed to usher in peace and lead to the holding of free and fair elections on 20 August 1995. After reviewing developments in Liberia since the signing of the agreement, the meeting agreed that *no progress has been made* towards achieving that objective.(emphasis mine)

Paragraph 29

It was re-affirmed that the Abuja Agreement remained the best and last framework for finding durable peace in Liberia and should thus be *retained in its entirety*. Consequently, it was suggested that the validity of the Abuja Agreement be extended for another nine months from 20 August 1996 to 15 June 1997. However, elections would be held on or about 31 May 1997. (emphasis mine)

¹⁶⁰ ECOWAS, *Final Report of the 39th Meeting of the Council of Ministers*, Abuja Nigeria 22-25 July 1996 (ECW/XXXIX/18/Rev.1).

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX C: MEASURES TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH THE ABUJA PEACE PLAN

- code of conduct for the COS that gave ECOWAS the power to replace erring members;
- freezing of business activities and assets of leading factions leaders in ECOWAS states;
- travel and residence restrictions;
- exclusion from participation in the electoral process;
- expulsion of members of families of the erring leader and their associates from Member State;
- restrictions on the use of ECOWAS airspace and territorial waters;
- a request to the UN Security Council to impose visa restrictions; and
- Finally, invoking the OAU summit resolution, which calls for the establishment of a war crimes tribunal to adjudge all human rights offences¹⁶¹

¹⁶¹ ECOWAS, *Final Report of the 39th Meeting of the Council of Ministers*, Abuja Nigeria 22-25 July 1996 (ECW/XXXIX/18/Rev.1).

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**APPENDIX D: REVISED SCHEDULE OF IMPLEMENTATION
OF THE ABUJA AGREEMENT FROM CEASE-FIRE TO
ELECTION AUGUST 1996—MAY 1997¹⁶²**

(Special Edition) 1997

Official Journal of ECOWAS

Vol 22

REVISED SCHEDULE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF
THE ABUJA AGREEMENT FROM CEASE FIRE TO ELECTION
AUGUST 1996-MAY1997

20 th to 31 st of August, 1996	A Cease-fire, disengagement of factions from checkpoints and present combat positions
1 st September to 30 November, 1996	Delivery of logistics supplies by international/donors to ECOMOG
20 th August 1996 to 31 st January 1997	Verification of ceasefire, and disengagement by ECOMOG, UNOMIL and LNTG
3 rd to 10 th October 1996	Assessment meeting in Liberia by chairman's special envoy with ECOMOG, UNOMIL, representatives of donor community and LNTG
12 th October 1996 to 31st January 1997	B Recce Mission by ECOMOG and UNOMIL of arms collection centers
4 th to 8 th November 1996	C Committee of Nine (Ministerial) Meeting in Monrovia
7 th November, 1996, to 31 st January 1997	Deployment of ECOMOG to Agreed Safe Haven by Committee of Nine

¹⁶² *Official Journal of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)*, Vol 22 (Special Edition) 1997.

22 nd November 1996 to 31 st January 1997	Disarmament, Demobilization and Repatriation
6 th -13 th January 1997	Verification visit to Liberia by chairman's special envoy with ECOMOG, UNOMIL, Representatives of Donor Community and LNTG
20 th January-15 April 1997	D Preparations for Elections
10 th to 15 th March 1997	Committee of Nine Meeting in Monrovia
17 th to 24 th April 1997	Assessment visit to Liberia by chairman's special envoy with ECOMOG, UNOMIL, Representatives of donor community
30 th May 1997	E Election day

Note

- | | | | |
|-----|--|---|------------------|
| (1) | Dissolution of all factions | - | 31 January 1997 |
| (2) | Registration of Council members and other office holders wishing to run for elective offices | - | 28 February 1997 |
| (3) | Election Day | - | 30 May 1997 |
| (4) | Inauguration of New government | - | 15 June 1997 |

APPENDIX E: MAP OF LIBERIA



THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Adekeye, Adebayo. *Liberia's Civil War: Nigeria, ECOMOG and Regional Security in West Africa* (Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2002).
- . *Building Peace in West Africa: Liberia, Sierra Leone and Guinea- Bissau*. (London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2002).
- . "Liberia: A War Lord's Peace." In *Ending Civil Wars: the Implementation of Peace Agreements*, editors. Stephen John Stedman, Donald Rothchild and Elizabeth M. Cousens (London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2002.)
- . "In Search of Warlords: Hegemonic Peacekeeping in Liberia and Somalia," *International Peacekeeping* 4 (Winter 2003): 63-81.
- Adibe, Clement. "The Liberian Conflict and the ECOWAS-UN Partnership" *Third World Quarterly* 18, no. 3 (1997): 471-488.
- African Confidential* 12 June 1995, 36 no 12.
- Africa Confidential*. Liberia: "Problematic Peacekeeping," 4 March 1994, 23.
- African Concord* 7 30 November 1992, no. 28, 7.
- Agetua, Nkem, *Operation Liberty: The Story of Major General Joshua Nimyel Dongoyaro* (Lagos: Hona Communications, 1992):81-87; Magyar, 59-63.
- Alao, C A. 'Commentary on the Accords.' in *Accord: An International Review of PeaceInitiative* 1 (1996): 1&11.
- Aning, Emmanuel kwesi. "War to Peace: Dilemmas of Multilateral Intervention in Civil Wars." *African Security Review* 9, no 3 (2000):1-16.
- Bekoe, Dorina A. "Towards a Theory of Peace Agreement Implementation: The Case of Liberia." *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 38, 2-3 (2003):256-94.
- Brabazon James, Liberia: "Liberians United for Reconciliation and Democracy (LURD)," the Royal Institute for International Affairs Briefing Paper no. 1 (February 2003): 2, www.CHG.org/pdf/research/atna/brabazon%70bpdf, accessed 1 September 2006.
- Collier, Paul. "Economic Causes of Civil Conflict and their Implications for Policy," in *Turbulent Peace*. Editors. Chester A. Crocker, Fen Osler Hampson and Pamela Aall, 144 (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace, 2003).

- Communiqué of the National Conference of All Liberian Political Parties, Patriotic Fronts, Interest Groups and Concerned citizens: Banjul The Gambia, August 27-September 1 1990, text in *Official Journal of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)*, November 1992.
- Ellis, Stephen. The Mask of Anarchy: The Destruction of Liberia and the Religious Dimension of an African Civil War. (New York: New York University Press, 2001).
- Ero, Comfort. "ECOWAS and Sub Regional Peacekeeping in West Africa." *Journal of Humanitarian Assistance*, (June 3, 2000) <http://www.jha.ac?article/a005.htm> accessed on 16 January 2006.
- Final Report of the Eight Meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the ECOWAS Committee of Nine on the Liberian Crisis, *Official Journal of ECOWAS, English Edition*, Vol 22, (1997): 104.
- Fortna, Virginia Page. Peace Time: Cease-Fire Agreement and the Durability of Peace. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004).
- Hartzell, Caroline A. "Explaining the Stability of Negotiated Settlement to Intrastate War." *Conflict Resolution* 43, 1, (1999): 3-22.
- Hampson, Fen Osler. Nurturing Peace: Why Peace Settlement Succeed or Fail. (Washington: D.C., U.S. Institute of Peace, 1996).
- Hoddie, Matthew and Caroline Hartzell. "Civil War Settlement and Implementation of Military Power Sharing Arrangements." *Journal of Peace Research* 40, no. 3 (2003): 303-320.
- Howard French. "In Liberia Life Returns to Grim Normality." *New York Times*, August 21 1996, A8.
- Howe, Hebert "Lessons of Liberia: ECOMOG and Peacekeeping." *International Security* 21 no. 3 (1996-1997): 146-245.
- International Crisis Group*. Liberia: Security Challenges." Report no 71 (3 November 2003).
- Joint Declaration on Cessation of Hostilities and Peaceful Settlement of Conflict. *Official Journal of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)*, November 1992.
- Kamara, Tom. "Liberia Can Peace be Consolidated." *UNHCR WRINET Paper* no 13/1999.

- . “Liberia: Civil War and Regional Conflict.” *UNHCR WRINRET Paper* no 17/2003.
- Khobe, Maxwell Mitikishe “The Evolution and Conduct of ECOMOG Operations in West Africa,” <http://www.iss.co.za/Pubs/Monographs/No44/ECOMOG.html> accessed 16 December 2005.
- Kihunan, Milkah. “Monitoring the Monitors: UN-ECOMOG Peacekeeping in the Liberian Civil War.” *Yale Journal of International Affairs* (Summer, 2005): 120-132.
- Liberian Post*. “Mano River War: Charles Taylor’s Mano River.” <http://liberian.tripod.com/Post25.html> accessed 22 February 2006.
- Lyons, Terrence. “Liberia’s Path from Anarchy to Elections,” *Current History*. (1998) <http://www.brook.deu/views/articles/lyons/199805.htm> accessed 12 November 2005.
- Makinlay, Alao John and Funmi Olaonisakin, Peacekeepers, Politicians, and Warlords: the Liberian Peace Process. (New York: United Nations University Press, 1999).
- Magyar, Karl P. “Liberia’s Peacekeeping Lesson for Africa.” in Peacekeeping in Africa, eds. Karl P. Magyar and Earl Conteh-Morgan, 179 (Hampshire: Macmillan Press, 1998).
- Mgboeji, Ikechi. Collective Insecurity: The Liberian Crisis, Unilateralism, and Global Order. (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2003).
- Moran, Mary H., and M Anne Pitcher. “The ‘basket case’ and the ‘poster child,’ explaining the end civil conflicts in Liberia and Mozambique.” *Third World Quarterly* 25, 3, (2004): 501-519.
- Momoh, Abubakar. “The Security Imperatives of the Crisis in West Africa: Preliminary Thoughts.” A Franco South African Dialogue Paper August 2000.
- Nuamah, Kwaku and William Zartman, *Case Study: Intervention in Sierra Leone, National Intelligence Council Project*, <http://www.cissm.umd.edu/NIC/nuamanzartman.pdf>, accessed 14 July 2006.
- Official Journal of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS's)*. Articles 1.2.d and 1.3 and decision A/DEC.2/8/90, November 1992.
- Pan African News Agency*, “Former Warlord Insists on ECOMOG Restructuring of the Army,” 16 February 1998.

- Ramcharan, B G, "Cooperation between the UN and Regional Organization in Internal Conflicts: The Case of Liberia," *African Yearbook of International Law* (1997).
- Rothchild, Donald. "Settlement Terms and Post Conflict Stability." In Ending Civil Wars: Implementation of Peace Agreements. Editors. Stephen John Stedman, Donald Rothchild, and Elizabeth Cousens, 117 (London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2002).
- Sawyer, Amos. Towards Democratic Governance in Liberia. (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2005).
- Sesay, Ahmadu Max. "Politics and Security in Post War Liberia." *Journal of Modern African Studies*, 34 no. 3(1996): 395-420.
- Stedman, Stephen John, Donald Rothchild, and Elizabeth M Cousens, 2002 Ending Civil Wars: Implementation of Peace Agreements (London: Lynne Rienner Publishers).
- Stephen Stedman and Donald Rothchild, "Peace Operations: From Short Term to Long Term Commitment." *International Peacekeeping* 3, no. 2 (Summer): 17-35.
- The Analyst, African News*, "Liberia; No Restructuring, No Elections, Warns 'Maj Gen' Joe Wylie, (March 30, 2005) <http://www.nexis.com/new/frame>, accessed 14 September 2006.
- Tuck, Christopher "Every Moving Car Gone" The ECOMOG Intervention in Liberia." *African Studies Quarterly*, <http://www.africa.ufl.edu/asp/v4/v4il a l htm> accessed on 30 November 2005.
- Toure, Augustine. "The Role of Civil Society in National Reconciliation and Peacebuilding in Liberia." *International Peace Academy* (April 2002):
- Tanner, Victor. "Railroading Peace." *Review of African Political Economy* 25, 75 (1998): 143-147.
- Tull, Dennis and Andreas Mehler, "The Hidden Cost of Power- Sharing: Reproducing Insurgent Violence in Africa." *African Affairs*, 104/416, (2003): 375-398.
- Tunji Olurin. "Can the ECOMOG Experience Provide Framework for other Sub regions?" 9 May 1999, <http://democracy-africa.org/articles/afr996.html> accessed 17 November 2005.
- U.S. Policy in Liberia, "Hearing before the Sub Committee on Africa of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, 18 May 1994 (Washington, D.C: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995), 103.

- USIP Peace Watch Online*, December, 1996
www.usip.org/peacewatch/1996/1296/peace.html accessed on 16 December 2005.
- Walter, Barbara. "The Critical Barrier to Civil war Settlement." *International Organization* 51, no. 3 (1997): 340-430.
- Walraven, Klass Van. "Containing Conflicts in the Economic Community of West African States: Lesson from the Intervention in Liberia, 1990."
- . *Pretence of Peacekeeping: ECOMOG, West Africa and Liberia (1990-1998)*.
West Africa, no 3952 (21-27 June 1993): 1054.
- West Africa*, September 19-25, 1994.
- West African Network for Peace-Building* (WANEP), "The Last straw for Peace or Total Anarchy." 10 July 2003.
- Wippman, D. "Enforcing the Peace: ECOWAS's and the Liberian Civil War." In Enforcing Restraint: Collective Intervention in internal Conflict, eds. L Fislér Damrosch, 169 (New York, 1993).
- Woods, Samuel Kofi. "Civil Initiative in the Peace Process." In *Accord: An International Review of Peace Initiative*, 1 (1996):1-4.
- Zartman, William. Ripe for Resolution. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985).
- Zlahn, Johannes Z. "Is the Abuja Accord Which Produced the July 19, 1997 General Elections a Binding and Enforceable Contract?" *New Horizon Journal Boston* (January/February/March 1999).

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1. Defense Technical information Center
Ft Belvoir, Virginia
2. Dudley Knox Library
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California
3. Defence Headquarters
Ministry of Defence
Area 7 Garki Abuja, Nigeria
4. University of Calabar
Calabar
Cross Rivers State, Nigeria
5. Douglas Porch
Chairman, Department of National Security Affairs
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California
6. Letitia Lawson
Department of National Security Affairs
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California
7. Karen Guittieri
Department of National Security Affairs
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California
8. Jessica Piombo
Department of National security Affairs
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California
9. Bisoye Oyefuna
United States Embassy
Abuja, Nigeria